W. A. Alexander
318 Warwick Rd
West Englewood
New Jersey

This Book Belongs To
Grace Church
Please Return

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/passionexaltatio0000fran

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

BY

FRANCIS J. HALL, D.D.

A series of ten volumes, each complete in itself, designed to constitute a connected treatment of the entire range of Catholic Doctrine.

Vol. I. Introduction to Dogmatic Theology.
" II. Authority, Ecclesiastical and Biblical.
" III. The Being and Attributes of God.
" IV. The Trinity.
" V. Creation and Man.
" VI. The Incarnation.
" VII. The Passion and Exaltation of Christ.
" VIII. The Church and the Sacramental System.
" IX. The Sacraments.
" X. Eschatology. Indexes.

THE PASSION AND EXALTATION OF CHRIST

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
55 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
221 EAST 20TH STREET, CHICAGO
TREMONT TEMPLE, BOSTON
210 VICTORIA STREET, TORONTO

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO. LTD.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, E C 4, LONDON
53 NICOL ROAD, BOMBAY
6 OLD COURT HOUSE STREET, CALCUTTA
167 MOUNT ROAD, MADRAS

THE PASSION AND EXALTATION OF CHRIST

BY THE
REV. FRANCIS J. HALL, D.D.
FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY IN THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK CITY

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
LONDON · NEW YORK · TORONTO
1929

COPYRIGHT, 1918, BY
LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

First Edition September 1918
Reprinted March 1929

Dedicated

TO THE

BLESSED MEMORY

OF

ST. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA

WHOSE ECUMENICALLY ACCEPTED EPISTLES
CONTINUE TO BEAR WITNESS TO
THE TRUTH OF OUR LORD'S PERSON
AND THEREFORE TO
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HIS DEATH
AND RESURRECTION

PREFACE

THREE central and complex mysteries of the Christian faith are dealt with in this volume: Those of the death of Christ; of His resurrection and ascension; and of His heavenly priesthood. All have been combated in modern days, and this fact increases the difficulty of embracing their treatment within the limits of such a volume as this. The author has been forced to pay attention to the apologetical aspects of his subjects; and while taking great pains to make perfectly clear their constructive aspects, as parts of a larger organism of saving truth, he has been obliged to dismiss some important questions with rapid summaries and references to fuller treatments elsewhere.

As in the previous treatises of this series, the determinate principle has been to exhibit faithfully and without reduction or mutilation the historic faith of the Church of God, but to do this in terms that will be as intelligible to modern minds as the writer can make them.

While discovering much onesidedness and caricature in the so called objective theories of the atonement which have marked the history of specu-

lative thought on that subject, the writer finds no reason for abandoning or modifying the New Testament doctrine that the death of Christ, coupled with His victory over death, accomplished in itself a real change in the relations between God and sinful mankind; and that this mystery is the historical and objective basis of the dispensation of saving grace and of our reconciliation to God through our living Saviour, Jesus Christ.

The ancient doctrine of our Lord's resurrection in true flesh from the dead, and His ascension therewith into heaven, as set forth in the Gospels, and not, as some have tried to prove, contradicted by the teaching of St. Paul, is also maintained in this volume. And an effort is made to show that the reasons given in our day for modifying this doctrine do not have the weight which is attached to them by certain writers. At the same time a few crude inferences from the catholic doctrine, which partly account for its alleged difficulties, are faced and eliminated.

The doctrine of our Lord's heavenly priesthood, although unmistakably set forth in the New Testament, and traditionally maintained in the Church, has waited for clear theological development until the nineteenth century. It is here exhibited as the vital connecting link between the redemptive death and resurrection of our Lord and the present dispensation of salvation and of restoration of the broken relations between God and men.

For space-saving reasons the titles of the works most frequently referred to are assembled in bibliographies on pp. 1, 164, and 264. In the references which follow these lists, the authors' names alone are ordinarily given.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

PART I. *Biblical Developments of Doctrine*

PAGE

§ 1. The doctrine of sin 1
§ 2. Redemption in the Old Testament 5
§ 3. Christ's teaching 10
§ 4. Apostolic teaching 15

PART II. *Objective Theories*

§ 5. Theories *vs.* catholic doctrine 20
§ 6. Patristic theories 21
§ 7. Anselmic and Scholastic 25
§ 8. Penal substitutionism 29

PART III. *Modern Theories*

§ 9. Socinian and Grotian 33
§ 10. Ideal penitent theory 36
§ 11. Moral theories 39
§ 12. The need of constructive synthesis 43

CHAPTER II

ELIMINATIONS AND PROBLEMS

PART I. *Eliminations*

§ 1. Forensic imputation 45
§ 2. Penal substitution 48
§ 3. Opposition between divine justice and love 52
§ 4. Predestinarianism 54

PART II. *Incidental Problems* PAGE

§ 5. How a temporal event can have effect in the eternal sphere 56
§ 6. How the death of one person can have redemptive effect on other persons 60
§ 7. How physical death can have spiritual results . . . 62
§ 8. The disparity between universal redemption and the extent of salvation 66

PART III. *The Problem of Love and Justice*

§ 9. That the loving God should be wrathful 69
§ 10. The exacting nature of true love 73
§ 11. Divine justice essential to divine love 76
§ 12. The love and justice of the Cross 80

CHAPTER III

THEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

PART I. *Anthropological*

§ 1. God's purpose for man involves persuasive methods 84
§ 2. But human nature is not self-sufficient 86
§ 3. And external methods of assistance are needed . . 88
§ 4. Also social and ecclesiastical methods 91

PART II. *Christological*

§ 5. The soteriological bearing of Christ's divine Person 93
§ 6. And of His human life 97
§ 7. The resurrection the completing factor of redemption 100
§ 8. And Christ's heavenly priesthood makes it abidingly effective 101

PART III. *Soteriological*

§ 9. Redemption has to be followed by salvation . . . 103
§ 10. What is included in redemption 104

PAGE

§ 11. Saving grace dispensed through the Church . . . 105
§ 12. Justification initiates the growth in righteousness wherein our salvation from sin consists . . . 107

CHAPTER IV

THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S DEATH

PART I. *Introductory Truths*

§ 1. The doctrine and its theology distinguished. Resumé of principles to be remembered . . 110
§ 2. Necessity and convenience of Christ's death . . . 113
§ 3. Christ is the Mediator and the Second Adam . . 115
§ 4. His death not substitutionary, although vicarious . 118

PART II. *Objective Aspects*

§ 5. Redemption and sacrifice for sin 121
§ 6. Remission and cleansing from sin 125
§ 7. Renewal of life and of evolution 128
§ 8. Propitiation and reconciliation 131

PART III. *Moral Aspects*

§ 9. Their relation to objective aspects 134
§ 10. Revelation and example 137
§ 11. Love's challenge 140
§ 12. The influence of the Cross 142

CHAPTER V

AMONG THE DEAD

PART I. *Our Lord's Death*

§ 1. The fact that He died 144
§ 2. The union between His Godhead and Manhood unbroken 145
§ 3. His body and spirit in death 147

PART II. *In Hades* PAGE

§ 4. Did he enter the place of the damned? 149
§ 5. His preaching to the dead 150
§ 6. His deliverance of captives 152

PART III. *Special Questions*

§ 7. The where of Heaven and Hell 154
§ 8. The Paradise of the penitent thief 157
§ 9. What of those who do not receive the Gospel in this life? 158

CHAPTER VI

THE FACT OF THE RESURRECTION

PART I. *Standpoints and Approaches*

§ 1. Of naturalism 164
§ 2. Of the historical method, exclusively used 168
§ 3. Of belief in an intrinsic opposition between flesh and spirit 170
§ 4. Of traditional Christianity 173

PART II. *The Evidence*

§ 5. Of St. Paul 176
§ 6. The kind of resurrection which he teaches 179
§ 7. Of the Gospels 183
§ 8. Confirmations from historical and theological contexts 187

PART III. *Objections to the Evidence*

§ 9. Variations in details 189
§ 10. The two traditions, Galilæan and Judæan 192
§ 11. Christ's non-appearance to people at large . . . 194
§ 12. The difficulty with which He was recognized . . . 197

CHAPTER VII

RIVAL THEORIES AND DIFFICULTIES

PART I. *Theories*

PAGE

§ 1. Swoon theory 200
§ 2. Theft theory. Did the women go to the wrong tomb? 202
§ 3. Vision theory 204
§ 4. Objective vision theory 207

PART II. *Some Difficulties*

§ 5. Reversal of physical death and scientific knowledge 208
§ 6. The closed door and the impenetrability of matter 210
§ 7. Our Lord's post-resurrection eating 214
§ 8. His clothing 217

PART III. *Flesh and Spirit*

§ 9. Belief in the resurrection of flesh not materialistic . 220
§ 10. St. Paul's teaching 224
§ 11. The increasing and abiding functional value of the flesh for our spirits 227
§ 12. Its value when our spirits are glorified 230

CHAPTER VIII

THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION

PART I. *In Relation to Christ Himself*

§ 1. Theological description of the event 236
§ 2. Changes in His body 239
§ 3. His justification and the vindication of His claim and teaching 240
§ 4. His human reward and exaltation 244

PART II. *In Relation to the Plan of God* PAGE

§ 5. This plan is revealed by both the natural and the supernatural 246
§ 6. Relation of the resurrection to the Incarnation and to the consummation 248
§ 7. And to redemption 250
§ 8. And to the new dispensation of grace 251

PART III. *In Relation to Us*

§ 9. Our physical resurrection 254
§ 10. Our justification 256
§ 11. Our new righteousness 259
§ 12. Our final participation in the divine nature . . . 261

CHAPTER IX

THE ASCENSION

PART I. *The Forty Days*

§ 1. Christ completed His self-manifestation 264
§ 2. And organized the Church 266
§ 3. The apostolic commission 268
§ 4. The mysteries of the kingdom 272

PART II. *The Withdrawal*

§ 5. A real movement into the sky 274
§ 6. Symbolically indicating a local destination somewhere 277
§ 7. Christ's session and heavenly titles 279
§ 8. His second coming, its time and manner 280

PART III. *Reasons for the Withdrawal*

§ 9. To centralize His work in space and time 284
§ 10. That is, as mediatorial Prophet, Priest and King . 286
§ 11. To prepare places for us 289
§ 12. To enable the Holy Spirit to come 291

CHAPTER X

THE HEAVENLY PRIESTHOOD

PART I. *Introductory* PAGE

§ 1. The meaning of priesthood 294
§ 2. Its place in religion 295
§ 3. In the Old Covenant 298
§ 4. The part therein of Christ's death 301

PART II. *Christ's Priestly Office*

§ 5. Its mediatorial and trinitarian basis 304
§ 6. Its eternal and temporal aspects 307
§ 7. Its consecration and modification in temporal aspects by the Cross 310
§ 8. Its being exercised in the Manhood 312

PART III. *The Heavenly Oblation*

§ 9. New Testament description 314
§ 10. Moral and effective aspects 317
§ 11. Our Eucharistic participation 319
§ 12. There is but one sacrifice 321

THE PASSION AND EXALTATION OF CHRIST

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. *Biblical Developments of Doctrine*

§ 1. The proper introduction to constructive treatment of any Christian doctrine is historical. Accordingly, this chapter will be given to such a very brief survey of the chief stages of the revelation of redemption, and of Christian thought concerning it, as our space permits.[1]

[1] On the Atonement and subjects covered by chh. i–v, below, see, for constructive treatments, St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Pt. III. qq. xlvi–lii; J. P. Norris, *Rudiments of Theol.*, Pt. I. ch. iii, and Pt. II; J. S. Lidgett, *Spiritual Principle of the Atonement;* L. Pullan, *The Atonement;* D. Stone, *Outlines of Christ. Dogma*, ch. vii; R. W. Dale, *The Atonement;* Jos. Pohle, *Soteriology;* L. Ragg, *Aspects of the Atonement;* Jas. Denney, *Death of Christ; The Atonement and the Modern Mind;* R. C. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality;* W. J. S. Simpson, *Reconciliation between God and Man;* T. J. Crawford, *The Doctr. of H. Scrip. Respecting the Atonement;* W. Milligan, *The Ascension*, Note B. pp. 340–366; P. B. Bull, *Instructions on the Atonement;* P. M. Rhinelander, *Faith of the Cross.*

Biblical treatments, J. K. Mozley, *The Atonement*, chh. i–iii; J. S. Lidgett, *op. cit.*, ch. iii; H. C. Beeching, *Doctr. of the Atonement;* A. Cave, *Scriptural Doctr. of Sacrifice;* L. Pullan, *op. cit.;*

But in order rightly to understand biblical ideas concerning redemption and salvation we have first to reckon with the biblical doctrine of sin. This doctrine has been set forth in a previous volume of this series,[1] and we here limit ourselves to indicating certain aspects of the subject which need to be kept in mind in all that follows.

Sin is described as disobedience to the will and law of God.[2] But the will of God is more than personal fiat. It is the ultimate standard of righteousness. It is this because it is controlled by and reveals the divine nature, wherein righteousness is eternally actualized and has its determinative centre.[3] Therefore sin is not limited in its God-

---

E. D. Burton and others, *Biblical Ideas of Atonement;* G. B. Stevens, *Christ. Doctr. of Salvation;* Hastings, *Dic. of Bible* and *Dic. of Christ*, various articles; A. B. Davidson, *Theol. of the O. Test.*, chh. vii–x; R. W. Dale, *op. cit.*, App. B.; J. P. Norris, *op. cit.*, Pt. II.

Historical, J. K. Mozley, *op. cit.;* H. N. Oxenham, *Cath. Doctr. of the Atonement;* J. Rivière, *Doctr. of the Atonement;* Jas. Orr, *Progress of Dogma, passim;* G. B. Stevens, *op. cit.*, Pt. II; Geo. C. Foley, *Anselm's Theory of the Atonement;* A. Ritschl, *Crit. Hist. of the Christ. Doctr. of Justif. and Reconciliation;* Nathaniel Dimock, *Doctr. of the Death of Christ*, App. (a catena to 1489 A.D.); J. F. Bethune-Baker, *Introd. to the Early Hist. of Christ. Doctr.*, ch. xviii.

For fuller bibliography, see J. Rivière, Vol. II. pp. 259–261; Geo. C. Foley, pp. 317–319.

Authors only will ordinarily be given in references to the above mentioned works.

[1] *Creation and Man*, chh. viii–ix (bibliographies, pp. 270–271, 281). Cf. the writer's *Evolution and the Fall*, Lecs. iv–vi.

[2] Rom. iii. 4; 1 St. John iii. 4.

[3] *Creation and Man*, p. 229 (c); *Being and Attrib. of God*, pp. 292–293.

ward effects to private and personal relations, but involves a violation of the eternal order and a breach of the fundamental continuity and reason of things. God is supreme, but in so far as He is God, He has to be true to the righteousness which describes His eternal essence and standpoint. In His righteousness lies His supremacy, and in His vindication of His supremacy lies the maintenance of righteousness.[1]

Accordingly, the dealing of God with sin cannot rightly be described in terms of arbitrary will or private good pleasure.[2] The disturbance by sin of relations between God and His creatures is more than a personal matter, and no mere fiat can remedy it. To become reconciled with God necessarily requires us to become reconciled with righteousness. The reason is not because righteousness is an external law which limits divine freedom, but because, from the fundamental and unalterable nature of things, God and righteousness are to all intents and purposes one.[3]

God is love because love is the central element of righteousness.[4] But a love which seeks to evade or

[1] This subject is more fully considered in ch. ii. §§ 10–11, below.

[2] The idea of Duns Scotus, *In Sent. Pet. Lomb.*, iii. 19–20. What we say is also corrective of St. Anselm's theory, wherein the personal honour of God is stressed to the neglect of the wider law of righteousness.

[3] Cf. next chapter, pp. 55–56 and § 11.

[4] 1 St. John iv. 7–21; Eph. v. 1–2; St. Matt. xxii. 37–39; Rom. xiii. 8–10; 1 Cor. xiii. 4–7; xvi. 14; Col. iii. 14.

reduce the claims of justice is not perfect after its kind. Love looks to personal relations, and the enjoyment of these relations depends upon mutual congeniality.[1] God loves us as created after His likeness, and as potential subjects of development in His righteousness, of which justice is an essential aspect. Therefore His love for sinners cannot impel Him to waive the claims of justice, but moves Him to help us to escape from sin and become godlike. And this display of love is as just as it is merciful, for it looks to the enjoyment of a communion and fellowship which is grounded in mutual possession of perfect righteousness.

God cannot pardon sin until provision has been made for its cure, and accomplished sin cannot be cured by mere penitence and future avoidance of sin. Furthermore, such avoidance itself is impossible without redeeming grace. The need of expiation, imperfect as every human explanation of it is, has always been recognized by sincere penitents as imperative. Moreover sin leaves consequences, both social and personal, which cannot be remedied by mere repentance.[2] The task of expiating accomplished sin, and of remedying its consequences, is too great for the natural man to achieve. In some way death and victory over death are involved even for penitents, and no death can be followed by victory, much less can enable others to share in it,

[1] *Being and Attrib.*, pp. 301–303.
[2] *Idem*, pp. 303–304.

except the death of such an one as Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of mankind.[1]

§ 2. The revelation of the need and of the method of salvation came in the first instance to a chosen race, and was gradual.[2] Its progress was conditioned by the growth of Israel in spiritual receptivity, through ages of discipline under manifold statutes and judgments. Formally speaking, the method of revelation was chiefly twofold — sacrificial and prophetic. But the very history of the chosen people was so overruled and controlled with reference to the mystery of redemption that it became a kind of parable, in which the Gospel drama was rehearsed with increasing fulness, and in which many significant types emerged.[3] The Israelites passed through a divinely ordered kindergarten school, the deeper meaning of which they could not realize, but which is apparent to those who read its sacred records in the light of accomplished redemption.[4]

The Old Testament sacrifices were developed out of preëxisting usages, usages not confined to the

[1] Cf. ch. iv. § 6, below.

[2] For refs. on O. Test. doctrine, see p. 1, note 1. On gentilic looking for a Saviour, see J. A. Macculloch, *Compar. Theol.*, ch. ix; W. R. Alger, *Crit. Hist. of the Doctr. of a Fut. Life*, pp. 456 *et seq.*

[3] In Psalm lxxviii the history of Israel, there summarized, is described as a "parable" and as "dark sayings." Cf. *Authority, Eccles. and Bibl.*, ch. vii. §§ 12, 14–15.

[4] *Creation and Man*, ch. x. § 5, and refs. there given. On O. T. symbols, see A. Jukes, *Types of Genesis;* W. S. Moule, *Offerings Made Like unto the Son of God.* That O. T. prophets did not fully understand their own prophecies, see 1 St. Pet. i. 10–12.

Hebrews.[1] But in the Jewish covenant, and by divine ordering,[2] they were lifted to a higher plane, and given forms which made them shadows "of the good things to come."[3] Thus the ritual of the Day of Atonement prefigured the Cross;[4] the daily and ever-smoking Burnt Offering foreshadowed the abiding heavenly oblation in which the Cross lives on;[5] and the Peace Offering, of which the Paschal Feast was an example, exhibited beforehand the communion with God which the death of Christ makes possible, and which is enjoyed when we sacramentally partake of the Flesh and Blood of Him through whom we gain access to God.[6] In the Sacrament of the Altar we also plead the atoning death of Christ and unite ourselves with Him in His heavenly obla-

[1] Hastings, *Dic. of Bib.*, *s. v.* "Sacrifice," A. iii; *Cath. Encyc.*, *q. v.*, I; W. R. Smith, *Relig. of the Semites;* J. A. Macculloch, *op. cit.*, ch. viii.

[2] That they were divinely ordered does not depend upon the accuracy of traditional views as to the part of Moses in their development, but upon our Lord's recognition of the authority of the law. Cf. St. Matt. v. 17–18.

[3] Heb. x. 1; viii. 5; St. Matt. v. 17; Gal. iii. 24; Col. ii. 17. On O. T. sacrifices and their typology, see L. Ragg, *op. cit.;* A. Jukes, *Law of Offerings;* W. J. Gold, *Sacrificial Worship;* E. F. Willis, *The Worship of the Old Covenant;* A. E. Edersheim, *The Temple;* Hastings, *Dic. of Bib.*, *s. v.* "Sacrifice," A.; *Cath. Encyc.*, *q. v.*, II; T. J. Crawford, pp. 254–263; L. Pullan, ch. iii; G. B. Stevens, Pt. I. ch. i.

[4] Levit. xvi. Cf. Heb. ix–x. A. Edersheim, *op. cit.*, ch. xvi.

[5] Levit. i; vi. 8–23. Cf. Heb. x. 5–14; viii. 1–4; ix. 24; Revel. v. 6; Heb. vii. 24–25. A. Edersheim, *op. cit.*, chh. vi–vii.

[6] Exod. xii. 11; Deut. xvi. 1–8. Cf. Heb. x. 19–22; 1 Cor. x. 16–21; xi. 26. A. Edersheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 134–136, and chh. xi–xiii.

tion. Thus the Old Testament figures are fulfilled in a permanent spiritual sacrifice, made effective by Christ's death and everlasting priesthood.[1]

The Old Testament sacrifices could not put away sin, except in the sense of ceremonial atonement, whereby Israel was accepted by God in view of the true atonement which these sacrifices figured.[2] It should be noticed, however, that recent investigation has overthrown the supposition that the word atonement, כפר, as used in connection with these sacrifices, meant a covering of guilt. Rather it meant wiping clean or making bright;[3] and the Israelites looked to a real cleansing of the soul from sin.[4]

But abuses crept in, and the prophets lifted their voices in protest against the growing habit of relying on sacrificial ritual as a substitute for personal repentance and forsaking of sin.[5] But strong as their protests were,[6] the whole course of Old Testament

[1] For this interpretation of O. T. sacrifices, see also *The Incarnation*, ch. ix. §§ 6–8. On their relation to Christ's priesthood and the Eucharist, see below, ch. x. § 3.

[2] Heb. x. 1–12. Cf. L. Pullan, pp. 86–91.

[3] L. Pullan, pp. 255–257, 62–64; J. K. Mozley, pp. 22–23. The subject is threshed in the Expository Times for 1911: Feb., pp. 232–234; April, two articles; May, pp. 378–381; and July, pp. 478–479, by Ed. Konig, S. H. Langdon and C. F. Burney. Cf. Job xxxi. 33; Prov. xxxviii. 13, where covering of sin is treated as futile.

[4] Zech. xiii. 1; Jerem. xxxiii. 8.

[5] *E.g.* in Hos. vi. 6; Amos v. 21–24; Isa. i. 11–17.

[6] When Jerem. vii. 22 and Amos v. 25 are dislocated from their larger biblical context, and the freedom of rhetoric is ignored, they seem to throw doubt on the divine requirement of sacrifice.

prophecy presupposes the place of sacrifice in the divine covenant, and, on the basis of purification by the Redeemer, even in the future messianic kingdom.[1] The prophetic message was that salvation was to be ethical, consisting of deliverance from sin.[2] Its ground was to be God's love, shown in readiness to forgive,[3] and the redemption which the promised Messiah was to achieve. Its conditions on man's side were to be faith and repentance, issuing in obedience.[4] This was to be brought about by an inner purification and renewal from above, by a writing of the law on human hearts.[5] The messianic kingdom was to be a kingdom of righteousness, extending over all the earth.[6]

The prophets came to see with growing clearness not only that this salvation was figured rather than achieved by animal sacrifices, but that a redemptive salvation was needed which human power could not accomplish. A divine Redeemer was required,[7]

[1] Cf. Psa. li. 16–19; Isa. lvi. 7; Mal. i. 10–11; iii. 1–4; Jerem. xxxiii. 18–21.

[2] Isa. xliv. 22; liii. 5, 10–11; Ezek. xxxvi. 25; xxxvii. 23; Zech. xiii. 1. Cf. Psa. li.

[3] Exod. xxxiv. 6; Numb. xiv. 18; Joel ii. 13; Jerem. xiv. 7; Isa. xlix. 13–16; liv. 5, 10; Job ii. 17; Psa. c. 5; ciii. 8–10.

[4] Deut. xxx. 1–10; Psa. li. 17; Isa. i. 10–20; Ezek. xxxiii. 10–20; Hab. ii. 4; 1 Sam. xv. 22.

[5] Psa. li. 5–12; Jerem. xxxi. 33–34; Ezek. xxxvi. 26–27.

[6] Isa. xi. 4–9; xlix. 6; lxi; Jerem. xxiii. 6; xxxiii. 15–16; Psa. lxxii.

[7] Psa. xlix. 7–8, 15; lxviii. 20; Isa. xlvii. 4; lii. 9–10; lx. 16. Cf. Job ix. 32–33.

and the coming Messiah was to be this Redeemer.[1] Taught no doubt by sacrificial symbolism, but also by the present sufferings of Israel, they caught glimpses of the truth that vicarious suffering was to be the manner of redemption.[2] The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah is the clearest Old Testament evangel. And it is not less significant because it had immediate reference to the sufferings of Israel, and was not understood in its messianic reference[3] until the promised redemption had taken place.[4]

In the meantime the carnal-minded Jews interpreted messianic prophecy in political and nationalistic terms. Thus they missed its deeper, ethical

[1] Psa. cx; Isa. ix. 6; Jerem. xxiii. 5–6; Mic. v. 2; Zech. xiii. 7; Mal. iii. 1.

[2] This is implied in the primitive prophecy that the serpent should bruise His heel, Gen. iii. 15. Cf. Psa. xxii. 1–21; lxix. 19–21; Isa. l. 6; Mic. v. 1; Zech. xi. 12–13; xiii. 6–7. It is clear that the O. T. prophets did not enter into the full meaning which their words on the subject were to unfold. Cf. 1 St. Pet. i. 10–12. The Jews at large were not looking for a suffering Messiah. See T. J. Thorburn, *Jesus the Christ*, ch. i; L. Pullan, pp. 166–168.

[3] See S. R. Driver and Ad. Neubauer, *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah according to Jewish Interpreters*. Cf. E. Kautzsch, in Hastings, *Dic. of Bib.*, Extra Vol., pp. 707–708; G. A. Smith, in *op. cit.*, *s. v.* "Isaiah," pp. 496–497; J. S. Lidgett, pp. 94–106; J. Rivière, Vol. I. pp. 34–48.

[4] On the prophetic doctrine of salvation, see Hastings, *op. cit.*, *s. v.* "Salvation," pp. 358–360; J. S. Lidgett, ch. iii; L. Pullan, ch. iii; A. F. Kirkpatrick, *Doctrine of the Prophets;* E. W. Hengstenberg, *Christology of the Old Testament;* T. J. Crawford, pp. 205–216; G. B. Stevens, ch. ii.

and expiatory aspects,[1] and rejected our Lord because He was not and would not be the external deliverer for whom they were looking.[2]

§ 3. Our Lord's human mind, being human, grew in the normal way. But being wondrously enlightened by grace, it grew perfectly,[3] and came to know the significance of His Person and messianic function with sufficient rapidity to forestall the possibility of His erring either in self-guidance or in teaching.[4] He must have gained during His childhood an understanding of prophecy concerning Himself which, to say the least, was astonishing;[5] and must have entered upon His public ministry with determinative knowledge of what He had come to teach, to do, and to suffer. It is to be acknowledged, in the present state of the question, that clear announcements of His messianic status and function, and of His death as related thereto, appear to have been deferred until the period following the confes-

[1] On these later Jewish ideas, see V. H. Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah;* J. Drummond, *Jewish Messiah;* W. Fairweather, in Hastings, *Dic. of Bib.*, Extra Vol., pp. 295–302.

[2] The Jews who were impressed by His miracles wanted to make Him King. St. John vi. 15.

[3] Cf. *The Incarnation*, chh. v. 6, viii. 2; *The Kenotic Theory*, chh. x–xii.

[4] On His messianic consciousness and security as teacher, see *The Incarnation*, ch. x. § 11; E. D. La Touche, *Person of Christ*, pp. 248–285; C. F. Nolloth, *Person of our Lord*, ch. vi; H. R. Mackintosh, *Person of Jesus Christ*, pp. 14–19; Hastings, *Dic. of Christ*, *s. v.* "Eschatology," B. 2.

[5] St. Luke ii. 46–49.

sion of Peter. But earlier indications of the mind which He then began to declare were not lacking; and so long as the fourth Gospel is recognized to have any historical value, reasons can be given for belief that some of these indications were fairly explicit.[1]

At all events, whatever may have been the temporal sequence of His utterances, they ultimately revealed a definite consciousness on His part of having come into the world to save lost sinners,[2] to give His life as a ransom for many,[3] and to shed His blood for the remission of sins.[4] He did not set forth a theology of the atonement; but when His teaching at large is interpreted in the light of these determinative assertions, and of the events which followed,[5] it can be perceived to afford a justifying basis of the later and more elaborate apostolic teaching.[6]

[1] See St. John iii. 14–17; vi. 51–58, 64, 70–71; x. 11, 15, 17–18. The words of St. John Baptist, "Behold the Lamb of God," etc., (St. John i. 29) would be clearly understood by such an one as Christ to foreshadow His death. Cf. in the Synoptic Gospels St. Matt. ix. 15; St. Mark ii. 20; St. Luke v. 35. See L. Pullan, ch. iv. §§ 2–3; J. S. Lidgett, pp. 82–87; J. Rivière, pp. 85–92; T. J. Crawford, pp. 11–12.

[2] St. Luke xix. 10.

[3] St. Matt. xx. 28; St. Mark x. 45. Cf. Psa. xlix. 7.

[4] St. Matt. xxvi. 28. Cf. St. Mark xiv. 24; St. Luke xii. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 25–26.

[5] His death, resurrection, and ascension, and the descent of the Holy Spirit, are determinative parts of the revelation given by our Lord which have to be reckoned with in its interpretation. See *The Incarnation*, pp. 275–276; T. J. Crawford, pp. 404–420; R. W. Dale, pp. 37–49.

[6] On Christ's teaching concerning His death, see L. Pullan, chh. iv–v; J. S. Lidgett, pp. 77–88; W. J. S. Simpson, ch. v; J. P. Norris,

Our Lord ascribes His mission to the Father's preëxisting love. "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."[1] The parable of the prodigal son enforces this truth.[2] Christ also ascribes His death to His own love. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."[3] That He did this voluntarily He makes clear. "No one taketh it away from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again." Yet He immediately adds, "This commandment I received from My Father";[4] and elsewhere He makes obedience to the Father the mainspring of His mission.[5] He described His death as something which had to be, for fulfilment of the Father's will[6] and of prophecy,[7] and for the effects which it was to bring about.[8] Therefore,

Pt. II. ch. ii; R. W. Dale, Lecs. ii–iii; J. K. Mozley, ch. ii; J. Rivière, Vol. I. ch. vi.

[1] St. John iii. 16.

[2] St. Luke xv. 11–32. To infer that repentance alone is necessary for men's salvation is to disregard Christ's other teaching, and to enlarge unduly the scope of the parable, which of course presupposes Christ's redemption. T. J. Crawford, pp. 416–420; L. Pullan, pp. 94–95.

[3] St. John xv. 9, 12–13. Cf. xiii. 1, 24; St. Matt. xxiii. 37.

[4] St. John x. 17–18.

[5] St. Matt. xxvi. 39–40 (cf. St. Mark xiv. 36; St. Luke xxii. 42); St. Luke ii. 49; St. John iv. 34; v. 30, 36; vi. 38; ix. 4; xvii. 4.

[6] St. Luke xii. 50; St. John xviii. 11.

[7] St. Matt. xxvi. 24, 54; St. Luke xxiv. 25–26.

[8] St. John xii. 24, 32.

while keenly sensitive to the horror of His passion,[1] "He steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem," [2] revealing in several utterances His knowledge that He was to die.[3] No doubt His death had other direct causation than His will to lay down His life. It certainly did not represent suicide. It was the inevitable result of His faithfulness to His mission,[4] and was caused by the spiritually blind leaders of His people. But as one of those leaders said, in terms more significant than he could understand, "It was expedient that one man should die for the people." [5]

Our Lord undoubtedly set forth those aspects of His death and of His mission which are emphasized in the so called moral theories of the atonement. His being lifted up was to draw all men unto Him,[6]

[1] St. John xii. 27; St. Matt. xxvi. 36–44; St. Mark xiv. 32–42; St. Luke xxii. 42–44. His agony was due not to lack of heroism, but to realization of what His death meant, to the climax of His battle with Satan, and to the burden of sin which He was taking on Himself. See St. Thomas, III. xlvi. 6–8; A. J. Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, ch. vi. § 17; Hastings, *Dic. of Christ*, *s. v.* "Agony"; T. J. Crawford, pp. 133–139.

[2] St. Luke ix. 51.

[3] St. Matt. xvi. 21 (cf. St. Mark viii. 31; St. Luke ix. 12); xii. 40 (cf. xvi. 4); xvii. 22; xx. 17–19 (cf. St. Mark x. 32–34; St. Luke xviii. 31–33); St. Luke xii. 50; St. John xii. 31–33.

[4] Plato gave an unconscious prophecy when he said, "The just man (who is thought unjust) will be scourged, racked, bound . . . and at last, after suffering every kind of evil, he will be impaled." *Republic*, II. 361, (B. Jowett's transl.).

[5] St. John xi. 49–52 (cf. xviii. 14). On the historical cause of Christ's death, see J. S. Lidgett, ch. ii; R. C. Moberly, pp. 114–116.

[6] St. John xii. 32.

constituting the most powerful challenge of love known to man.[1] His life was designed to be a life of service,[2] which should be an example for men to follow, even to the Cross.[3] Moreover He put the saving value of His teaching to the forefront; [4] and defined the conditions of salvation as including repentance on men's own part,[5] their belief in Him [6] and their obedience to His commandments.[7] The notion that His death alone could save them, as by an automatic working, is inconsistent with this teaching.

But the relations in which He places men to Himself as their Lord and Master,[8] and above all as the Mediator between them and God,[9] prepare us to read a deeper meaning into His life and death than the so called moral aspects alone contain. He came not only to teach and to lead, but also to save.[10] He

[1] St. John xv. 12–13.

[2] St. Luke xxii. 27.

[3] St. Matt. x. 38; xi. 29; xvi. 24; xx. 25–28; St. Mark viii; 34–35; x. 21, 43–45; St. Luke ix. 23–24; xiv. 26–27; St. John xiii. 13–15. Cf. St. John xvii. 19.

[4] St. Matt. v. 29; St. John v. 34, 40; viii. 12; ix. 5; xiv. 6 (cf. x. 27; xvi. 13–14).

[5] St. Matt. iv. 17; ix. 10–13; St. Luke xiii. 3; xv. 7, 21–23; xxiv. 47.

[6] St. John v. 37–47; vi. 27–29; 46–47, 68. Cf. xx. 31; and the app. of St. Mark xvi. 16.

[7] St. Matt. x. 37–39; xi. 28–30; xvi. 24–25, etc.; St. John iii. 36; xiv. 15, 23–24; xv. 10, 14. Cf. St. Matt. xxv. 1–30; St. Luke i. 33.

[8] *E.g.* St. John xiii. 13. [9] St. John xiv. 6.

[10] St. Luke xix. 10; St. John iii. 16–17.

came that men might have life,[1] and the life which He came to give them is expressly conditioned by a vital union with Him, and by feeding on His flesh.[2]

It is in the light of such teaching that we should interpret the two utterances of Christ concerning His death which most directly ascribed objective efficacy to it: — "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." "This is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many unto the remission of sins."[3] Further discussion of these passages must be postponed, but they plainly teach three truths: (*a*) that man's deliverance from the slavery of sin was the designed purpose of Christ's death; (*b*) that the shedding of His blood became the basis of the saving covenant; (*c*) that remission of sins is grounded therein. This teaching interprets such sayings as, "I am the Good Shepherd: the Good Shepherd layeth down His life for the sheep." "Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit." "Now is My soul troubled; . . . Father save Me from this hour. But for this cause came I unto this hour."[4]

§ 4. The apostles took up Old Testament teaching, as it was brought to a head by the evangel of

[1] St. John, v. 40; x. 10.

[2] St. John vi. 51–58; xiv. 19–20; xv. 1–10; xvii. 21–23. Cf. 1 St. John v. 11–12.

[3] St. Matt. xx. 28; xxvi. 28.

[4] St. John x. 11; xii. 24, 27. Cf. iii. 14–17.

the suffering servant,[1] and completed it in the light of our Lord's teaching and of the accomplished facts of His death and resurrection. They borrowed freely from current forms of Jewish thought and language, using the most readily available symbols. But the manner of their use of these conceptions and symbols was determined and controlled by the teaching of Christ, as completed and interpreted by His death and resurrection, and as understood by the guidance of the Holy Spirit.[2]

A real development of soteriological doctrine took place during the apostolic period, for the minds of the apostles required time and conditioning circumstances to reckon with the numerous aspects and implications of the comprehensive mysteries which had been revealed to them. But this development shows no trace of substantial innovation, or of departure from what had been received from the Lord. The several apostolic writers selected different elements and aspects of soteriology for emphasis and development; but no real mutual inconsistencies between their resultant teachings can be found. They made no attempt to present a

[1] Cf. Acts viii. 30–35; Heb. ix. 28; 1 St. Pet. ii. 22–25. See J. S. Lidgett, pp. 89 *et seq.;* L. Pullan, pp. 165–169; R. W. Dale, p. 470 (note F). Christ had appropriated Isa. liii. 12 as referring to Himself. St. Luke xxii. 37.

[2] On apostolic teaching, see J. K. Mozley, ch. iii; L. Pullan, chh. vi–viii; J. S. Lidgett, 35–76; J. P. Norris, Pt. II. chh. iii–iv; W. J. S. Simpson, chh. vi–viii; R. W. Dale, Lecs. iv–vi; J. Rivière, chh. iv–v; G. B. Stevens (moral theory standpoint), Pt. I. chh. iv–vii.

complete theory of the atonement. They simply exhibited, in the terms then available and intelligible, the complex truths which have to be reckoned with in any adequate doctrine of redemption and salvation.

This was done most comprehensively by St. Paul. The regulative and context-providing ideas which controlled his soteriological conceptions are chiefly (*a*) his acknowledgment of Christ as eternal Son of God and Lord of glory,[1] who by being born of a woman became the second Adam;[2] (*b*) the doctrine of the mystical Body,[3] in which by Baptism we are united in Christ and become participators in His death and resurrection;[4] (*c*) our justification,[5] or the imputation to us for righteousness of our faith in Christ,[6] such faith being the beginning in us of the development by grace of true righteousness — that is, our becoming children of God by adoption and grace[7] giving us the divinely accepted status of those who are growing after the likeness of Jesus Christ;[8] (*d*) the necessity that, on the basis of what Christ has done and is doing for us, and with the help of His grace, we should work out our own salvation.[9]

[1] Acts ix. 5; Col. i. 13–17; Rom. ix. 5; Phil. ii. 6.
[2] Gal. iv. 5–6; Rom. v. 15–21; 1 Cor. xv. 21–22.
[3] 1 Cor. x. 17; Eph. i. 22–23; iv. 12; v. 23; Col. i. 18, 24.
[4] 1 Cor. xii. 13. Cf. Eph. v. 30; Gal. iii. 27; Rom. vi. 3–5.
[5] Rom. iii. 26–iv. 25; Gal. ii. 16; iii. 8–9; v. 6; Phil. iii. 9.
[6] Rom. iv. 5.
[7] Rom. viii. 14–17; Gal. iii. 26–29; iv. 5–7; Eph. i. 5.
[8] Rom. vi. 2–11; Eph. iv. 13.
[9] Phil. ii. 12.

It can be seen that St. Paul nowhere teaches that the death of Christ completed our salvation. On the contrary, while he declares that we are "reconciled to God through the death of His Son," he adds that we shall "be saved by His life." [1] The distinction between the redemptive effects of Christ's death and victory over death and the subsequent work of salvation made possible by redemption is vital to St. Paul's thought.

The key words to his more specific teaching concerning the meaning and objective effects of Christ's death and victory are sacrifice,[2] redemption,[3] propitiation [4] and reconciliation.[5] Their exposition will be attempted elsewhere.[6] We here content ourselves with three introductory thoughts. In the first place, these terms are borrowed from current use, and yet are given the authority of "sound words," [7] the meaning of which is to be determined by their Christian and spiritual reference and context. In the second place, they are symbols rather than fully definitive terms. This does not mean that they are mere figures of speech or extraneous analogies, but that they are inadequate. They are the truest terms available, they were selected under divine guidance, and they must determine our thinking

[1] Rom. v 10. [2] 1 Cor. v. 7; Eph. v. 2.
[3] Eph. i. 6–7; Col. i. 13–14; 1 Tim. ii. 5–6; Tit. ii. 13–14.
[4] Rom. iii. 25.
[5] Rom. v. 10–11; 2 Cor. v. 18–21; Eph. ii. 15–18; Col. i. 20–22.
[6] See ch. iv. §§ 5–8, below. [7] 2 Tim. i. 13.

concerning the aspects of Christ's death with which they are severally concerned. They indicate the true lines of Christian belief.[1] Finally, these symbols are to be taken together, if we would enter into their real meaning. Each term represents an incomplete part of a complex mystery; and no one of them can safely be used apart from the rest, as a basis of theorizing, without onesided caricature resulting.

These remarks apply to all New Testament symbols on the subject. For example, the Epistle to the Hebrews sets forth the conception of the death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin, which need never be repeated;[2] but connects it with the continuing mystery of our Lord's heavenly priesthood, and with our approach to the Holy Place through the veil of His flesh and by His blood.[3] And St. John stresses what may be called the biological aspect of life, which Christ's work has procured for us;[4] but he unites with this the aspects of light and of love,[5] and is not forgetful of the propitiatory side of the mystery.[6]

[1] On the symbolical nature of our knowledge and terminology in divine mysteries, see *Being and Attrib. of God*, pp. 47–48, 231–234; *Trinity*, pp. 276–278.

[2] Heb. x. 11–14, 18.

[3] Heb. v. 7–10; vii. 24–25; viii. 1–3; x. 19–22. See Geo. Milligan, *Theol. of the Ep. to the Hebrews, in loc.*

[4] 1 St. John i. 1–3; v. 1, 11–12, 20. Cf. St. John iii. 15–16; v. 24–26, 40; vi. 33, 35, 47–51; x. 10–11, 28; xiv. 6, 19; xvii. 2. See ch. iv. § 7, below.

[5] 1 St. John iv. 7–21. Cf. St. John i. 4, 9, 16–17; viii. 12; xii. 46; xiv. 21.

[6] 1 St. John ii. 2.

II. *Objective Theories*

§ 5. By theories of the atonement[1] we mean attempts to rationalize and unify the mystery of our Lord's death in one self-coherent conception. Owing to the complexity of the mystery, these attempts almost invariably result in laying exaggerated stress on some one aspect of biblical teaching and in at least subordinating, if not altogether suppressing, other and equally vital aspects. So it is that the history of theories of the atonement is mainly a history of onesided caricatures of biblical doctrine which have successively given way to reactionary conceptions as onesided as themselves.

But such a history does not describe Christian thought in its fulness, which through all phases of its development has retained for catholic theology an unqualified acceptance of the manifold elements of apostolic teaching and symbolism. And the Church has been withheld by the Holy Spirit from giving ecumenical authority to any theory of the atonement. She has contented herself with the very general, although determinative, dogma that it was "*for us men and for our salvation*" that He who is "*of one substance with the Father*" "*came down from heaven, and was incarnate . . . and was made man, and was crucified also for us.*"[2] In the Church's liturgies and service books the substance of all the

[1] For references on the history of theories of the atonement, see p. 1. n. 1, above.

[2] Nicene Creed.

New Testament teaching on the subject can be discovered, and no ascertainable element of it has failed to receive general acceptance within the Church when set forth without theoretical enhancement and caricature. Under such circumstances the lack of a dogmatic *formula*, in which the several elements of the mystery of the Cross are defined in just proportion, is providential rather than prejudicial to the saving faith that *Our Lord's death and victory over death is the formal method by which the loving God has redeemed mankind, and therefore is the divinely provided means by which salvation from sin through the living Christ has been made possible.*

§ 6. The theory that our Lord redeemed us by paying the ransom of His life-blood to the devil[1] — the outcome of onesided stress on the term "ransom" — was first clearly set forth by Origen,[2] and

[1] This theory supposes (a) that Satan obtained a *quasi* right to man's service by his free yielding to temptation; (b) that God willed to recognize this right, and to buy it off by the ransom of Christ's blood; (c) that the devil was deceived into accepting this ransom, which he could not retain; (d) and which he forfeited by slaying one over whom he had no claim; (e) that, the right being cancelled, the Redeemer conquered the devil and delivered mankind from his power. It is to be noticed that the fathers did not confuse ransom with sacrifice, but recognized that the sacrifice of Christ was offered to God. For the history and explanation of the theory, see H. N. Oxenham, chh. ii–iii; J. Rivière, chh. xxi–xxiv; J. S. Lidgett, pp. 420–428; G. C. Foley, pp. 40 *et seq.*; J. F. Bethune-Baker, ch. xviii.

[2] *In Matt.* xvi. 8; xx. 28; xxvi. 1; *In Rom.* ii. 13. He also treated, Christ's death as a propitiatory sacrifice to God, *In Rom.* iii. 8; *In Numeros*, Homil. xxiv. 1. He does not relate these two ideas. See J. Tixeront, *Hist. of Dogmas*, vol. I. p. 274.

was accepted by various writers until the twelfth century.[1] It ought not, however, to be called the patristic theory, for it was repudiated by such eminent writers as St. Gregory of Nazianzus and St. John of Damascus,[2] and cannot be found in the majority of patristic writers.

The theory was objectionable in making redemption a transaction with the devil, and in its development seemed to ascribe to the Saviour a deceitful procedure. But its rejection has been accompanied by an overlooking of certain truths which it embodied, and to which it owed its vitality. These truths are (*a*) that for man's sake, and as a just consequence of his yielding to the temptation of the devil, the evil one has been permitted by God to exercise a real sway over mankind, not less real because obtained by a great wrong; (*b*) that this sway of the devil is a true part of the servitude from which we are redeemed; (*c*) that redemption involved our Lord's submission to, and victory over, satanic temptation, and that His death was due to the devil's instigation. But Satan found nothing in Him by which to obtain moral sway over Him, and in bringing death upon Him he justly forfeited the sway over mankind which because of human

[1] St. Greg. Nyss., *Great Catechism*, xxii–xxvi; St. Leo Mag., *Serm.* xxii. 3–4; St. Ambrose, *In Ev. Luc.*, iv; St. Jerome, *In Ephes.* i. 7. It is to be noticed that many fathers spoke of our Lord's *conquest* of Satan, using the idea of deception by His human disguise, without speaking of any ransom paid to the devil.

[2] St. Greg. Naz., *Orat.* xlv. 22; St. John Dam., *Orth. Fid.*, iii. 27.

sin he had been permitted to exercise. Lying behind the modern contempt for this theory[1] is also the unhappy loss of belief in the reality of a personal Satan and of his kingdom.

The fathers were too absorbed in other controversies to pay much attention to the theological development of the doctrine of Christ's death, but they made some significant contributions to it. Origen's thought on the subject was by no means confined to his ransom theory, but embraced various aspects of New Testament doctrine. St. Irenæus, St. Athanasius, and others developed the mystical and what has been called in these pages the biological aspect of St. John's writings.

To St. Irenæus our Lord is the recapitulation and summing up of the human race, in whom we recover the likeness of God which was lost through the first Adam's sin.[2] Our Lord became what we are in order that we might become what He is. St. Athanasius repeats this thought in sharp form, declaring that God became man in order that we might become God.[3] The thought appears to be

[1] A very few Anglican writers have supported it, at least in part. *E.g.* Thos. Jackson, *Works*, vol. vii. pp. 434–436, 502–511; Philip Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*, Pt. II. pp. 30–38.

[2] St. Iren. *Adv. Haer.*, iii. 19. 1; v. 16. 2; v. 21. 1.

[3] St. Iren. *Adv. Haer.*, v. Pref., fin.; St. Athan. *De Incarn.*, 54, and elsewhere. Further refs. given by A. Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, Vol. III. pp. 164–165, note 2. See esp. St. John Damasc., *Orth. Fid.*, III. 17, where the implication that our nature ceases to be human is guarded against.

that we may share in divine immortality, in this sense becoming "partakers of the divine nature." "God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life."[1] In the opening parts of his work on *The Incarnation*,[2] St. Athanasius speaks of Adam's sin as having caused a falling away from immortality into corruption. By taking our nature our Lord provided a quickening medium by the reception of which we are recovered to immortality. On the other hand, he does justice elsewhere to the doctrine that the formal method of redemption is through the death of Christ, which he describes as a payment to God in our behalf of the debt which man has incurred through sin.[3]

That the beginnings of a penal conception of the passion can be found in the Fathers cannot be denied, but this conception receives no formal development; and, generally speaking at least, the term "substitution" is quite too strong as a description of their thought concerning the vicariousness of our Lord's passion.[4] St. Cyril of Alexandria was led by his controversy with Nestorius to emphasize the significance in interpreting our Lord's death of His

[1] 2 St. Pet. i. 4; 1 St. John v. 11–12.

[2] Esp. §§ 4–10. Cf. *Orat. c. Ar.* II. § 70.

[3] *De Incarn.*, § 20. 2. Cf. § 9. 1–2; and *Orat. c. Ar.*, II. § 66.

[4] What they said with figurative rhetoric moderns have erected into formal theory, and then have read their theory into ancient rhetoric. Geo. C. Foley shows this.

being personally divine;[1] and this thought not only precludes the supposition that he taught penal substitutionism in the modern sense, but has served as a permanent safeguard against the more extreme and really immoral elements of that conception.

Tertullian gave the term "satisfaction" a place in catholic theology, but as descriptive of an element of repentance, and this the original theological use of the term still survives in sacramental theology. Its use to describe the expiatory aspect of the passion came later.[2] Latin patristic theology of the atonement, which contains nothing distinctive, such as would here require comment, was crystallized and summed up by St. Augustine and by St. Gregory the Great.

§ 7. St. Anselm (A.D. 1033–1109) caused a new departure by emphasizing the need of making reparation to God for sin.[3] The analogies of the penitential system of the Church led to his appropriation of the term satisfaction to describe the Godward effect of the passion;[4] and those of feudalism sug-

[1] *Thesaur. de Trin.*, Migne, *P. G.*, lxxv. 284; *Quod unus sit Christus*, *P. G.*, lxxv. 1268. Cf. J. Rivière, Vol. I. pp. 224–227. St. Cyril continually refers to Christ's death and covers almost every aspect of New Test. doctrine.

[2] J. F. Bethune-Baker, pp. 353–355. Tertul., *De Poenitentia*, v. Tertullian was followed by St. Cyprian, *De Lapsis*, xvii.

[3] See his *Cur Deus homo*, esp. i. 11, 21, 24; ii. 4, 6, 10, 18–19. Cf. H. N. Oxenham, pp. 181–188; J. Rivière, ch. xviii; Geo. C. Foley, pp. 101 *et seq.*; G. B. Stevens, pp. 141–151, 240–244; L. Pullan, pp. 103–106; R. C. Moberly, pp. 367 *et seq.*

[4] He was anticipated in this by Radulfus Ardens (end of 11th century), *In Dom.*, Pars I[a], hom. ix; Col. 1700–1701, according to Rivière.

gested the thought that sin involves not only a failure to pay the debt of obedience, but also dishonours God. Divine dignity requires not only man's return to obedience, but also either the punishment of accomplished sin or some other adequate satisfaction of divine honour. Although the hypothecated satisfaction is not penal, it is said to enable God to show mercy, and to remit the punishment of sin, without loss of honour. Man ought to meet this obligation, but cannot, for his obedience is due in any case, and the propitiating gift which can satisfy divine honour is too great for man to offer. It can only be offered by a divine Person. By taking our nature the eternal Son identified Himself with man, and thus united in Himself the power both to represent mankind and to pay the debt by an adequate satisfaction. As man He owed and paid perfect obedience to God, but being sinless He did not owe death, which is due only because of sin. Therefore by dying for us He made full satisfaction to divine honour. That is, He accomplished something infinitely pleasing to God; and since He was eternally possessed of divine blessedness, and needed no reward for Himself, the divine pleasure passes over to those for whom He died, in the form of forgiveness and future blessedness.

In spite of its serious defects and of its non-scriptural symbolism, this theory illustrates the possibility of emphasizing the Godward and propitiatory aspect of the passion without committing ourselves to the

immoral implications of penal substitutionism;[1] and this is important.

The faults of this theory are obvious. (*a*) It is based upon *a priori* considerations, and upon passing mediæval analogies, rather than upon apostolic teaching; (*b*) It is too mechanical, external and ingenious in its seeming completeness to be truly descriptive of the complex union of objective and ethical mysteries in the Cross; (*c*) By stressing the personal honour of God, and by neglecting to find place for the larger requirements of righteousness *in se*, St. Anselm in effect reduces God to the level of an earthly despot, who is concerned with his private good pleasure rather than with the eternal and ethical order of things; (*d*) Although the truth of divine forgiveness is borne witness to, the exaggerated stress on the satisfaction of the Father's honour by the Son seems to crowd it out, so far as the Father is concerned, and suggests a dualism as between an exacting Father and a compassionate Son. And this dualism has vitiated much subsequent speculation concerning the objective aspect of the atonement; (*e*) The organic relationship between Christ and His members, which is needed to explain our participation in the benefits of His death, and which is secured by the establishment of the mystical Body, is not clearly set forth. These criticisms apply to his theory rather than to his entire thinking, which his writings at large show to have been richer and more ethical in content.

[1] Considered in our next section.

Modern thought was in an important particular anticipated by the freethinking Abelard (A.D. 1079–1142). Although he seems to have accepted the objective aspect of the atonement, his leading thought on the subject was that the death of Christ was designed to be a supreme exhibition of divine love, calculated to challenge a loving human response and to lift men to the freedom of children of a loving heavenly Father.[1]

St. Thomas Aquinas (A.D. 1226–1274) can hardly be said to have broached a theory of the atonement. He presented a conspectus of orthodox teachings on the subject.[2] Granting in the abstract that it was possible for God to pardon mankind without exacting the reparation of the Cross, he stressed its necessity in view of eternal foreordination and prophecy and of its ethical fitness. He described the passion as efficient by way of merit (through the mystical Body), of propitiation, of sacrifice and of redemption, its sufficiency being derived from the Godhead of the Person who suffered. He summarizes its effects as including deliverance from sin, from Satan's power, and from punishment, reconciliation to God, and opening of the gate of heaven. He ignored St. Anselm's distinction between satisfaction and punishment, and crystallized the unfortunate notion that Christ was punished for our sins. He also helped on the development of the mechanical conception of a quantitative transfer

[1] J. Rivière, Vol. II. pp. 54 *et seq.;* J. S. Lidgett, pp. 460–461.
[2] In *Summa Theol.*, III. xlvi–xlix.

of Christ's merits to His members, a development which paved the way for the external substitutionism and purely forensic imputationism of post-reformation thought.

Duns Scotus (d. 1308 A.D.) denied both the infinite guilt of human sin and the infinite value of Christ's passion, and maintained that a purely arbitrary will of God is the real basis of His acceptance of the passion as reparation for sin.[1] The logic of this is to nullify the ethical aspects of the Cross, and, as a consequence, to undermine the whole doctrine of objective atonement.

§ 8. No space is available for a comprehensive account of the complex developments of soteriology which the protestant revolution brought about. But our purpose requires a brief statement and criticism of the penal substitution theory, inasmuch as modern thought concerning the atonement has been largely determined by it, either as a positive influence or as the cause of reactionary moral theories.

The protestant revolt involved for its supporters a loss of the doctrines by which Christian believers had hitherto connected the finished work of redemption with the continuing mystery of salvation and sanctification of souls. The doctrines referred to are those (*a*) of the continuing and saving priesthood of Christ,

[1] J. S. Lidgett, pp. 140, 458–459; Hastings, *Encyc. of Relig.*, *s. v.* "Acceptilation"; A. Ritschl, ch. ii. §§ 11–13. H. N. Oxenham, p. 149, gives refs. to show that certain fathers believed that God could have saved mankind by fiat. But they did not develop the thought.

which His death has once for all consecrated; (*b*) of the visible Catholic Church, which is the mystical Body of Christ, wherein the Holy Spirit unites us with the Redeemer, and thus enables us in Christ not only to participate mystically in His death, but also by His grace to work out our own salvation from sin; (*c*) of the Church's ministerial priesthood, whereby, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, Jesus Christ dispenses grace on earth to the faithful members of His mystical Body, and affords to them the means of eucharistic pleading of His death and acceptable self-oblation to God.

The loss of these doctrines created a gap between the past fact of Christ's death and the present salvation of souls; and this had to be bridged, if the biblical doctrine of objective atonement was to retain its practical value and living power. The new soteriology was naturally determined by a disproportionate development of what was retained of relevant scriptural doctrine, and by efforts to make it do duty for the whole Christian scheme. Man's own part in his salvation was minimized to the last degree in the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith only and of forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness to believing sinners. And Christ's death came in practical effect to be regarded not only as redemptive, but also as His achievement *in our stead* of whatever is necessary to be done for human salvation. The stress in this direction was placed upon the punishment of sin, which Christ was said to have endured

in order to save the redeemed from the need of enduring it.[1] The new scheme was completed and hardened by the doctrine of a secret and absolute predestination from eternity of certain souls to glory and of the rest to damnation.[2]

The scheme reached its scholastic completion in the seventeenth century; and although it has in practice been modified and softened by the bulk of protestant writers since that time, this has been at the cost of consistency. There has been, and so long as its characteristic elements are retained, there can be, no successful rebuttal of the criticism that it misrepresents the divine character and makes salvation an immoral transaction, one which evades rather than provides for man's escape from sin.

Pending further criticism at a later stage,[3] we content ourselves at present with calling attention to certain errors: — (*a*) The notion that Christ's righteousness is imputed to us is unscriptural. According to St. Paul, it is our own faith that is thus imputed,[4]

[1] It is to be acknowledged, as Jas. Orr points out, pp. 223–238, that the reformers stressed the need of a righteous basis for the atonement, and lifted the problem out of the sphere of private right (Anselm) into that of public law, grounded in the eternal nature of God.

[2] For explanations of the penal substitution theory, see H. N. Oxenham, pp. 221–242; G. B. Stevens, pp. 151–156, and Pt. II. ch. iii; J. S. Lidgett, pp. 470–474; Jas. Orr, pp. 233–239; J. A. Mœhler, *Symbolism*, § 14; A. Ritschl, chh. v–vi. Among recent consistent maintainers of it are W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogm. Theol.*, and Chas. Hodge, *Syst. Theol.*

[3] See chh. ii. 2 and iv. 4, below.

[4] Rom. iv. 3–5.

this faith being the beginning and potential principle of our becoming truly righteous; (*b*) Men are not passive recipients of salvation, but although redeemed by Christ's death, and dependent for the possibility of salvation upon the grace of Christ, the actual working out of salvation requires their own coöperation with this grace, and growth in righteousness, under the conditions afforded by the Saviour in His mystical Body; (*c*) Although our Lord bore sufferings that for us are penal consequences of sin, there is no trace in Scripture of their being penal in His case, except as regarded from the erroneous standpoint of His persecutors; (*d*) In the redemptive aspects of His passion, He may be said to have suffered in our stead, but to develop this aspect into a formally complete theory of substitution is to exaggerate it to the point of caricature. This is especially so when substitutionary punishment is asserted; for neither was He punished, nor is our punishment wholly remitted. It is true that by redeeming grace our sufferings cease to be merely penal and become purificatory as well, but they are not lifted until patience has completed her perfect work, and sin has been really abolished in us; (*e*) The sixteenth century doctrine of absolute predestination and particular redemption is not only unscriptural, but contradictory to biblical teaching concerning the will of God and the reality of human probation.[1]

[1] On predestination, see *Creation and Man*, ch. i. §§ 7–12. Calvinists distinguished between the active obedience of Christ's life,

III. *Modern Theories*

§ 9. Modern theories have been almost wholly of two types, (*a*) those which by way of reaction from penal substitutionism reject objective atonement altogether; (*b*) those which are designed to preserve belief in objective atonement by modifications of the substitutionary theory. It will serve our purpose to deal first with the latter.

The Socinian theory really stands by itself.[1] Because of its reactionary nature, and its stressing the exemplary aspect of Christ's death, it has usually been classed with moral theories; but Socinus did not reject *en bloc* the doctrine of objective atonement. What he did was to connect it with our Lord's resurrection and heavenly priesthood, and to define expiation as His delivering us from sin and its consequences through His heavenly intercession, and by exercise of the prerogative which God has given Him because of His obedience unto death. His death secured for Him this reward, affords us an example, and enables Him to sympathize with us in our ills.

It should be noted that Socinus rejected the divine

---

the merits of which are imputed to us, and the passive obedience of his death, which makes satisfaction for sin. See J. S. Lidgett, pp. 140–149.

[1] On the Socinian theory, developed by Laelius Socinus (A.D. 1525–1562) and elaborated by his nephew, Faustus Socinus (A.D. 1539–1604) in *Praelectiones Theol.*, cc. xv–xxix, more briefly in *Christianæ Religionis Brevissima*, see J. K. Mozley, pp. 147–151; J. S. Lidgett, pp. 474–476; G. B. Stevens, pp. 157–161.

rank of Christ's Person, and betrayed utter inability to realize how vitally the truth of our Lord's Godhead determines the meaning and value of His death. His criticisms of orthodox doctrine concerning the passion were acute, and will have to be reckoned with in their proper place. His protest in behalf of the then neglected ethical aspects of the Cross was needed, as was also his emphasis on the resurrection and heavenly priesthood. But his work was nullified and discredited by his onesidedness and especially by his unsound Christology.

The jurist Hugo Grotius (A.D. 1583–1645) undertook, as against Socinus, a defense of the proposition that by His passion our Lord paid the penalties due for our sins, in order that, "without prejudice to the demonstration of the divine righteousness," we might through faith "be freed from the penalty of eternal death." [1] His distinctive emphasis is placed upon the *governmental* supremacy and righteousness of God. "The preservation and example of order" constitutes the aim of God's punishment of sinners; and, provided this aim is achieved, it is not necessary that punishment should be distributed to men according to their guilt. In fact the innocent are often grievously afflicted by God. It was right, therefore, that a notable example should be made of Christ. By giving Him up to the death of the Cross God af-

[1] On the theory of Grotius, see T. J. Crawford, pp. 380–394; J. S. Lidgett, pp. 151–154, 480–481; G. B. Stevens, Pt. II. ch. ii and pp. 252–255, 417; J. K. Mozley, pp. 151–156.

fords an exhibition and vindication of governmental justice; and this enables Him, without imperilling His moral government, freely to pardon those who by faith in Christ's death ratify the condemnation of sin, therein declared.

The most obvious objection to this theory is its excessively juristic form, and its consequent obscuration of the moral aspects of the atonement. The purpose of human government is, indeed, the preservation of public order; and ethical interests enter only so far as they are embodied in those forms of visible conduct which affect the maintenance of it. The state deals with crime rather than with sin, and the purpose and justification of human penal justice lies in its supposed effect in reducing crime. But sin is not only more extensive in its prevalence than crime, it is not amenable as such to the methods of human government.

The problem of redemption has to do with deliverance from sin; and this is not solved in terms of punishment. Sinners must indeed endure punishment so long as they remain sinners, and no forensic substitution can exempt them from this ethical requirement. But the problem is to deliver men from sin itself, and to remedy its manifold and fatal consequences. A display of governmental justice in the form of punishment of a sinless one does not achieve this result. On the contrary, it violates the ethical requirement that the sinner shall himself bear the penal consequences of his guilt. The theory of

Grotius, in brief, is open to all the difficulties of penal substitutionism, and evades rather than lightens the difficulty of explaining how the Cross affords a redemption which is at once loving and just and which affords the basis of a true salvation from sin. It hypothecates a purely external and ingenious transaction; and like penal substitutionism not only magnifies divine justice at the cost of divine love, but seems to create an incredible opposition between the respective attitudes toward sin of the Father and of the Son.

§ 10. The only other modification of substitutionism which here requires our attention was suggested, although rejected, by Jonathan Edwards, senior (A.D. 1703–1758), and was developed by Dr. J. McLeod Campbell (A.D. 1800–1872) [1] and Dr. R. C. Moberly (A.D.1845–1903).[2] Dr. Moberly lays down as his double premise the requirement of perfect penitence for the remedy of sin, and the impossibility that such penitence should be shown by a sinner, because of the morally deadening effect of sin upon human hearts and consciences. His theory is that the conditions of perfect penitence were fulfilled by Christ, and that His complete identification with us through his catholic Manhood gives to His penitence a representative value for us. More than this, the

[1] See Jonathan Edwards, Sr., *Satisfaction for Sin;* and J. McLeod Campbell, *The Nature of the Atonement.*

[2] In his *Atonement and Personality*, a work which, apart from the theory here criticized, has great value.

Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ, applies this objective achievement subjectively to the members of Christ by progressively transforming their sinful personalities after the pattern of the Cross.

The seeming merit of this theory is that it aims to do justice to the moral requirements of salvation from sin, without sacrificing the objective aspect of Christ's death. This latter is retained by treating the death of the Cross as a necessary element and completion of the perfect repentance for sin which is supposed to be required. But both the premise and the theory to which it leads are without warrant either in Scripture or in the teaching of experience.

Ideal penitence is a self-contradictory conception. Penitence is sorrow for one's own sin, flowing from love, and placing the sinner in the attitude towards God which makes him susceptible to the work of saving grace. In order to be sufficient it must include real love, real acceptance of the divine condemnation of sin, and real turning to the means of recovery and satisfaction which the death of Christ has won for us. Moreover, it is not sufficient unless these elements become permanent and increasingly effective factors in progressive personal dissociation from sin, made possible by the grace of Christ which is applied to us through His Holy Spirit. In brief, it is the abiding and growing reality of contrite love and sorrow and of turning to the way of life, rather than their abstract perfection, that constitutes sufficient repentance — sufficient, that is, to fill out

what is meant by justifying faith in the death of Christ.

The illustration of a hospital patient is clearly relevant. A patient means one whose body is sick, and who submits himself to the physician's treatment. It is not at all needful for his cure that he should fully realize the nature and significance of his illness, provided he realizes it sufficiently to be moved to submit to treatment and to follow the physician's directions. It is of the essence of his being a patient that he should be sick. A hospital filled with people whose condition is ideal is surely a strange hospital. Similarly, a penitent means one whose soul is sick because of sin, but who is submitting to treatment by the Physician of souls, and according to his imperfect capacity is utilizing the Physician's remedies and following His directions. In faithfulness to his rôle of penitent lies his hope of recovery, rather than in the impossible combination in one person of the respective characteristics of a sick soul and of a perfectly healthy one.

One of the most secure results of modern scrutiny of the Gospel records is the conclusion that our Lord had no consciousness of personal guilt, and such consciousness is a determinative part of real penitence. We must acknowledge, as vital to His equipment as our Redeemer, that He was "touched with the feeling of our infirmities,"[1] and that through His uniquely intense experience of the hardness of victory over

[1] Heb. iv. 15.

temptation He attained a full and sympathetic identification with our sorrows. Moreover, He possessed in perfect degree the horror of sin which we can approximate only, and that gradually only and through His saving grace. His condemnation of sin is the "Amen in humanity," as Dr. Campbell calls it, which we must make our own — not less truly because our acceptance of it is achieved by loving faith in Him rather than by adequate realization of what sin means. The contention that Christ was a penitent cannot be substantiated, and this fact alone overthrows the theory under discussion.

Finally this theory has no biblical support. That we must repent in order to receive the benefits of Christ's death is, no doubt, frequently set forth in the New Testament; but the work achieved by the death of Christ is described in other terms than those of penitence, which, indeed, cannot alone afford adequate basis of salvation. "Sacrifice for sin," "redemption," "propitiation" and "victory over death" point to an objective achievement of which penitence is not a true description, although what Christ did procures the conditions which make repentance possible and saving.[1]

§ 11. Modern moral theories of our Lord's death illustrate the truth of the saying that "Heresy is the vengeance of suppressed truth." In the middle ages

[1] On the ideal penitent theory, see J. K. Mozley, pp. 193–196; G. B. Stevens, pp. 211–216 *et passim;* W. Sanday, *Life of Christ in Recent Research,* IX; J. S. Lidgett, pp. 170–180.

the moral aspects of the passion received attention in an incidental way, as affording evidence of the convenience of that method of redemption.[1] The emphasis then laid on good works and on man's own part in salvation also prevented the moral aspects from being wholly neglected. But the tendency to pay disproportionate attention to the expiatory aspect of the Cross, and to neglect the truth that Christ's death is the method of divine love, and not its cause, can be detected in most of the scholastic theologians after the time of St. Anselm. Protestant theologians perpetuated and hardened this tendency; and their minimizing man's part in justification and salvation helped to make their theory of penal substitution appear like the displacement of moral requirements by an external and magically automatic transaction between a vindictive God and His more pitiful Son.

The condemnation of this suppression of truth which the so-called moral theories represent inevitably engages the earnest sympathy of all who believe in divine love and in the part which man must play in his salvation, if he is not to be treated as a non-moral subject of forensic make-believes. But this sympathy ought not to hide from us the reactionary animus of moral theories, their onesidedness — not less excessive because appealing, — and their suppression of the truth of objective atonement which sixteenth and seventeenth century theories caricatured.

[1] *E.g.* St. Thomas, III. xlvi. 3–4.

It is impossible to exhibit the many forms which moral theories have assumed.[1] But the truths which they have recovered, even while excluding other and equally vital truths, are chiefly the following: (*a*) that the death of Christ is due to the love of the Father for His sinful children, and is not the cause of such love; (*b*) that it is not a self-working and automatic means by which human salvation is externally and completely achieved, but is the inception of a dispensation in which human hearts are reached, and men are afforded both the motive and the power to work out their own salvation, to escape from the enslavement of sin, and to attain to righteousness and to the full enjoyment of divine sonship in the kingdom of God; (*c*) that the Cross is both a challenge from divine love and an inspiring example; and that it has mighty influence as such in moving men to that loving, contrite and believing response which conditions and initiates their personal salvation.

The moral theories are determined both in their points of emphasis and in their omissions by reaction. They are therefore onesided,[2] and when tested by the

[1] G. B. Stevens, Pt. II. ch. v, gives an informing survey of subjective theories of Schleiermacher, Rothe, Ritschl, Sabatier, Jowett, Bushnell, W. N. Clarke and others, and develops the moral aspects constructively in Pt. III. T. J. Crawford reviews these theories adversely, *op. cit.*, Pt. III. The arguments against objective theories are given with skilful acumen by W. A. Wright, *Problem of the Atonement.*

[2] On the onesidedness of reactionary developments, see *Introd. to Dogm. Theol.*, ch. vi. § 19.

New Testament are found to be dangerously defective. Their most obvious defect is their more or less radical suppression of the vicarious and redemptive aspects of what the death and resurrection of our Lord of themselves objectively achieved.

As either contributory or incidental to this primary defect, and to the exaggerated stress that has been laid upon man's part in saving himself, the following errors are to be noted: (*a*) a lowered conception of Christ's Person, which has tended to obscure the Godward significance and value of His death, and its objective effect upon the status before God of those for whom it was endured; (*b*) a continuance of the protestant rejection of the truths of the heavenly priesthood of Christ and of His mystical Body, upon allowance for which depends a true understanding of the vicarious aspect of the Cross; (*c*) modern theories of sin, especially those of purely evolutionary type, which reduce men's realization of its seriousness and radical effects, both internal and external, and of the complex requirements which have to be met in saving men from it; (*d*) a more or less complete revival of Pelagianism,[1] with its optimistic view of what men can do for their own salvation without supernatural aid, when they take advantage of the historical example and abiding personal influence of the ideal Man, Jesus.

[1] On Pelagianism, see J. F. Bethune-Baker, ch. xvii; W. Bright, *Anti-Pelagian Treatises of St. Augustine*, Introd.; Jas. Orr, pp. 153–159; J. B. Mozley, *Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination, ch. iii.*

§ 12. It can be seen that each successive theory of Christ's death has retained, and obtained acceptance through retaining, some precious aspect of that mystery. But each has gained coherence at the cost of sacrificing vital parts of the complex whole, and has exaggerated to the point of caricature what truth it has retained. What is needed is synthesis, a bringing together in just proportion and on New Testament lines the several truths which theories have torn from their mutual connections and have caricatured. Thus only shall we attain to a sound and adequate theology of the Cross.[1]

The truths, for example, which modern moral theories emphasize are not less vital for a sound and just conception of Christ's death because they have previously failed to secure adequate attention. And the task of restating the doctrine of the atonement in terms that will do proportionate justice to them is perhaps the most pressing of all duties by which catholic theologians are to-day confronted. We say *proportionate* justice, for the objective aspects of this doctrine, the aspects which many to-day suppress, also need to be given their scriptural emphasis.

The task is full of difficulty, and many writers will have to contribute to its achievement. But the direction in which success lies is perfectly clear. The method of building a theory of the atonement around some selected aspect of the Cross has been

[1] J. S. Lidgett, pp. 123–130; T. J. Crawford, pp. 395–401. Cf. pp. 3–5.

repeatedly tried and has invariably failed. An inductive synthesis ought to be resorted to, and theologians ought to keep in view the complexity of the subject of the Cross, and the importance of not shutting out any truth connected with it. The temptation to sacrifice truth in the interest of simplicity and coherence is sternly to be resisted.

CHAPTER II

ELIMINATIONS AND PROBLEMS

I. *Eliminations*

§ 1. Thoughtful consideration of the theories by which men have attempted, and have failed, to rationalize the complex mystery of redemption and salvation brings to light the need of carefully eliminating some ideas, if we are to escape certain difficulties which these theories have imported into our subject. The doctrine of the atonement is difficult in any case. But the difficulties to which we refer are not found in scriptural teachings as comprehensively regarded. They are created by exclusive emphasis upon fragments of biblical doctrine, and by pressing certain New Testament figures of speech beyond their scriptural application and reference. In brief, they are products of human speculation rather than necessary elements of the subject.

First of all, we ought to eliminate the notion that the God of truth and justice resorts to forensic imputation,[1] whether of our guilt to Christ or of His

[1] In his *Commentary on Gal*, iii. 13, as quoted by G. B. Stevens, Luther says, "God laid on Christ the sins of all men, saying to him: Be thou Peter, that denier; . . . that thief which hanged upon the Cross; and, in short, be thou the person which hath committed

righteousness to us. The presumption is overwhelming that a method of dealing with sin which appears untrue and immoral to men cannot be divine.[1] It took a long time for Israel to learn that "the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him,"[2] and that what is needed is the turning of men from sin to righteousness. But what was so slowly learned by the ancients has become a Christian truism, which only needs to be reasonably stated, in order to be ratified by the moral judgment of all enlightened and unprejudiced Christian believers.

The texts which are depended upon to prove the transfer of our guilt to Christ do not prove it, for they can be otherwise interpreted without doing violence to their meaning and reference. Christ was made a curse for us because He hung on the tree and those who were thus treated were held to be under a curse,[3] that is by men. There is no scriptural evidence that God's own curse rested on Christ. It is said that God "made Him to be sin

all the sins of men." Cf. also C. Hodge, *Syst. Theol.*, Vol. III. ch. xvii. §§ 5–7; Hastings, *Encyc. of Relig.*, *q. v.* For criticisms, see G. C. Foley, pp. 226–230; G. B. Stevens, pp. 456–458; J. P. Norris, pp. 62, 224, 266.

[1] Not because man's ways are adequate measures of God's, but because righteousness has its seat in God, and what we know of its fundamentals must control our ideas of what God is likely to do.

[2] Ezek. xviii. 20.

[3] Gal. iii. 13. Cf. Isa. liii. 4. It was man who esteemed Him smitten of God.

for us who knew no sin," [1] but the paradoxical form of the saying should preclude the radical inference that God transferred our guilt to Him. The thought is that God willed that Christ should be reckoned amongst transgressors,[2] that is by men, and should be crucified by those who thus regarded Him. It is safe to say that Christ was never more favourably regarded by His heavenly Father than when He was pouring forth His life for sinners.

It is equally impossible to find in Scripture the notion that Christ's righteousness is imputed to the unrighteous. The righteousness which St. Paul says is imputed to us is the righteousness of our own faith; [3] and this righteousness is not imputed by way of forensic transfer, but is based upon the fact that our faith constitutes a response to the grace of Christ which initiates the growth of His righteousness in us. This is confirmed by the statement that "through the obedience of one shall the many be made righteous." [4] Plainly this does not mean that Christ's obedience leads to our being regarded as righteous independently of our becoming so. Rather it refers to the fact that by His obedience unto death, our Lord won for us the redeeming

[1] 2 Cor. v. 21.

[2] St. Mark xv. 28; St. Luke xxii. 37. The reason why "it pleased the Lord to bruise Him" was to "make his Soul an offering for sin." "He was wounded for our transgressions . . . and with His stripes we are healed." Isa. liii. 10, 5.

[3] Rom. iv. 5.

[4] Rom. v. 19, 21; vi. 1–14.

grace whereby, when we believe, we are enabled to imitate His righteousness. It is a making righteous,[1] not a forensic imputation of righteousness, that is in view.

The error which is here rejected is of mediæval origin, and is involved in the theory of a treasury of superabundant merits, of which the Church is said to make use in the system of indulgences.[2] But although connected in Latin theology with a context of doctrine and discipline which bears clear witness to the necessity of good works and of perseverance in sanctifying grace, this theory is not less subversive in itself of the scriptural doctrine of salvation than is the later theory of forensic imputation. The truth which modern moral theories have once more emphasized, and which cannot be abandoned without serious consequences resulting, is that salvation from sin can come to no man unless, with the assistance of redeeming grace, he works out his own salvation by repenting of his sins and by truly growing in righteousness.

§ 2. The notion of penal substitution is to be

[1] Not that justification itself means making righteous, but that the accounting righteous which it does mean coincides with the inception of a state of grace in which we are enabled to grow in Christ's righteousness. Cf. *Creation and Man*, pp. 343–345; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, pp. 30–31, 36–39, 152.

[2] Cf. p. 96, below. This doctrine is not in theological exposition so crude as it is represented in protestant polemic, but does imply a quantitative conception of merit and its transfer, as distinguished from our growth in grace through repentance and discipline.

eliminated for similar reasons.[1] The punishment of one who is not guilty, followed by exemption from punishment of the real sinners, appears on the face of it to be a parody of justice, and to violate the moral requirement that "the soul that sinneth it shall die."[2] The penalty of sin is twofold: (*a*) the temporary sufferings of men, which culminate in physical death; (*b*) the death of the soul, or its final or permanent exclusion from the divine communion and fellowship for which man was made. The former penalty has not been removed by Christ's death; and the latter was not endured by Him,[3] its removal from us being caused not by any penal substitution but by our deliverance from sin — *i.e.* by the redemptive value of His voluntary sacrifice for sin, and by the subsequent dispensation of saving

[1] Already considered historically in ch. i. § 8, above. On the true doctrine of vicariousness, see ch. iv. § 4, below. For discussions of penal substitutionism, see G. B. Stevens, pp. 244–252; W. A. Wright, *Problem of the Atonement*, ch. vi; G. C. Foley, pp. 181–187; P. B. Bull, ch. ii; A. J. Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, ch. vi. § 20; J. S. Lidgett, pp. 286–288.

[2] Ezek. xviii. 4 *et seq.*

[3] John Calvin says, *Institutes*, Bk. II. ch. xvi. § x, that Christ "suffered in his soul the dreadful torments of a person condemned and irretrievably lost." Bossuet held the same view, Mystères, I^ier^ *Sermon sur la passion*. Few to-day would accept such a view. It is, however, the logical outcome of the assumption that Christ's sufferings must take the place of our punishment. Cf. J. Rivière, p. 19; J. S. Lidgett, pp. 149–151. We need to distinguish between reparation for sin and compensation for the remission of its penalties, and to give up the vain labour of proving equivalence as between Christ's sufferings and the penalties due to sinners.

grace for which His redemption has prepared the way.

The penalties which penitent sinners do not escape cannot be remitted. This is so because justice, as perceived by the consciences of all sincere penitents, requires their infliction for accomplished sin. But the punishment of eternal death is remitted, because salvation from sin justly secures the termination of suffering, when previous sins have been sufficiently punished, and when the soul has acquired the righteousness which is pledged in its reconciliation to God. In this connection we should note that, because of redeeming grace, and of our contrite response to it, the punishment which we cannot escape becomes also a purificatory discipline, whereby our perfecting is promoted until patience has completed its perfect work.[1] Punishment and purification thus become harmonious aspects of the same just and loving dispensation, the perfecting success of which at last removes its necessity and terminates its continuance.

The only standpoint from which our Lord's passion is treated in Holy Scripture as penal — as His punishment — is the admittedly false one of His persecutors and of sinful by-standers. The true idea can be seen in the much misinterpreted prophetic evangel, "Surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem Him . . . smitten of God. . . . But He was wounded for

[1] Heb. xii. 5–11; St. Jas. i. 3–4.

our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed . . . and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all. . . . For the transgression of my people was He stricken. . . . It pleased the Lord to bruise Him; He hath put Him to grief: when thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin, He shall see His seed," etc.[1] Here we find that "the chastisement of our peace was upon Him," that is, that by the will of God He endured sufferings and stripes which when endured by us constitute our chastisement; but the sacred writer carefully avoids saying that they constituted chastisement to Him. To Him they were our griefs and our sorrows, with which, obediently as a lamb, and as an offering for sin, He identified Himself, in this sense taking upon Him our iniquities. To Him these sorrows became, indeed, uniquely intense, so that men "were astonished" at Him and "esteemed Him not"; but the interpretation of the prophet, that His soul was made "an offering for sin," is not equivalent to the theory that He was punished.

We have need to remember that it was God who in Christ's Manhood endured the passion; and the loving assumption by God-incarnate of sufferings due in our case to sin, but voluntarily shared in by Him, cannot rightly be described as a divine infliction of punishment. And, as has been shown, the sufferings which Christ endured still have to be

[1] Isa. liii. Cf. 2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. iii. 13.

participated in by us. Even on the Cross He is our example.[1] There is, therefore, no penal substitution. It cannot be denied that the term "substitution" is in line with certain scriptural phrases,[2] and also with many expressions in patristic literature. But in its formal use it gives emphasis where Scripture does not, and expresses a more determinative idea than New Testament teaching, comprehensively regarded, justifies. The subject will call for treatment later on.[3] We content ourselves at this point with repudiating the theory of substitution which describes it as penal. Our repudiation of this is absolute.

§ 3. Again, we ought to eliminate every idea concerning Christ's death that implies an opposition between the love and the justice of God, and which suggests either that God had to put aside the exercise of love for sinners until the requirements of His justice had been satisfied, or that the Father and the Son were in some sense opposed to each other through the wrathful justice of the one and the merciful love of the other.[4] The God in the presence of whom Christ is our propitiation is the triune God, in whose indivisible essence and

[1] St. Matt. xi. 29; Phil. ii. 5–8; 1 St. Pet. ii. 21–25.

[2] *E. g.* the preposition *ἀντί* and compounds in which it is incorporated.

[3] Ch. iv. § 4, below.

[4] G. C. Foley, pp. 173–176 (in relation to St. Anselm's theory); H. Bushnell, *Vicarious Sacrifice*, Pt. III. ch. iii; G. B. Stevens, pp. 385 *et seq.*; W. A. Wright, *op. cit.*, pp. 158–160.

comprehensive attributes our Redeemer fully and eternally participates. The Son is therefore not less exacting in His justice than the Father, nor is the Father less loving than the Son. The Scriptures do not speak of the Son as intervening between the Father and His children but as sent by the Father to redeem and save them.[1]

Moreover, there can be no opposition between the attributes of God, and no abeyance of one of them during the manifestation of another. Each and every true divine attribute describes, however inadequately, what is eternally and uninterruptedly actualized in God and in each of the several divine Persons.[2] And we fail to interpret a given attribute rightly when we so stress it as to minimize the full and perfect actuality of some other attribute of God. It was the preëxisting love of the Father for sinners that moved Him to spare not His own Son;[3] and His justice, while shown in the manner of redemption, does not in the slightest degree reduce the truth that the redemption constitutes the method of a love which has never been wanting. Being the eternal seat of justice, God cannot evade justice in dealing with sinners; but being eternal love, neither can His dealing be other than loving.

It is our readiness to press unduly the analogies of finite and imperfect human justice and love that

[1] *E. g.* St. John iii. 16–17.
[2] Cf. *The Trinity*, pp. 243–249, 251–252.
[3] Rom. viii. 31–32.

tempts us to conceive erroneously of an opposition between these attributes in God which His infinite perfection wholly transcends and excludes from His actions. The only available terms by which divine attributes can be revealed to us are those of human experience; but we may not use them as reasons for reading their human limitations and oppositions into the ineffable nature and operations of the Infinite.

§ 4. Finally, we must eliminate every form of predestinarian doctrine which obscures the double truth that Christ died for all mankind, and that men are truly free either to respond to redeeming grace with saving result or to reject it at the cost of just condemnation.[1] That God willeth the salvation of all men,[2] although under conditions which He cannot fail to exact if He is true to His righteousness, is the plain teaching of the New Testament. And the mission of the Church to extend the offer of salvation to every creature[3] is reduced to a mockery, if the refusal of many to hear the saving message is to be explained as an effect of God's eternal will that they shall be consigned to perdition.

The opposite truths of the eternal and unchangeable will of God and of the contingent element in human probation, when brought into juxtaposition, obtrude a metaphysical problem the full solution

[1] Cf. *Creation and Man*, pp. 23–26, 37–38; D. Stone, p. 228; W. A. Copinger, *Predestination*, chh. ix–x.

[2] 1 Tim. ii. 4. [3] St. Matt. xxviii. 19; App. of St. Mark xvi. 15.

of which lies beyond the range, method and capacity of human speculation.[1] Yet it is reasonable to maintain that, if the eternal is immutable, and if, therefore, God cannot change His will, none the less He both can and does will the changes which take place in time, including their moral conditions and contingent elements.[2] At all events, both of the truths in question are taken for granted, and occasionally asserted, in Scripture; and each in turn is confirmed by the rational considerations that are available to human thinkers. The truth that God's mercy extends to all who can be persuaded to accept it and fulfil its necessary conditions, is too abundantly set forth in the New Testament, and too precious in every way, for us to obscure it by onesided speculation.

Every form of non-moral arbitrariness is foreign to the teaching of God's self-manifestation. And it teaches us that, however inscrutable His ways may in certain respects appear to those whose intelligence is controlled by temporal conditions and by the limited analogies of finite experience, the moving cause of each dispensation of God must be defined, so far as we can define it, as necessarily determined by a just and loving wisdom. There can be no purely arbitrary, that is unmotived or capricious, will of God. The notion, therefore, that the value and acceptance of Christ's death on the

[1] Discussed in *Creation and Man*, ch. i. §§ 7–12.

[2] *Op. cit.* ch. i. §§ 1–6.

Cross as the historic basis of pardon and salvation is to be explained by the mere will of God, without reference to any moral necessities and intrinsic considerations, is to be eliminated.[1]

No doubt every human attempt to explain the divine background of the atonement, and to describe just how the death of Christ is related to divine attributes, is inadequate. It must necessarily be so. But the assumption that a justice and a love which God cannot violate and be true to Himself have determined His choice of method in redeeming and saving us, is one which cannot be disregarded in our speculations concerning Christ's death, without fatally undermining the Christian doctrine of God.

II. *Incidental Problems*

§ 5. It is surely to be expected that difficult problems will emerge when we seek to understand the complex mystery of the Cross. The fact that they do emerge ought not, therefore, to be a source of misgiving. It is rather a necessary incident in this line of investigation, the absence of which would prove either that we had overlooked the deeper aspects of Christ's death, or that it was not the dispensation of infinite wisdom which our faith declares it to be.

We are not maintaining that the Cross is wholly baffling to human intelligence, so as to preclude

[1] The allusion is to Duns Scotus' theory, to which reference is made in p. 29, above.

any acceptance except that of blind credulity. The Gospel of redemption is addressed to our intelligence. It is given in terms which lend themselves to a fruitful degree of human understanding, and which impose upon us the duty of interpreting them as adequately as we can. Were this not so, the message of the Cross would be a sheer enigma, in which men at large could have no vital interest. But the message is sufficiently intelligible to gain the joyful acceptance of those who rightly consider it. The difficulties which come to the surface when we study it are not of the kind that either prove its intrinsic incredibility or show that efforts to increase our understanding of it are useless. Complete understanding is indeed beyond us, but growth in the perception of the wisdom and significance of the Cross is quite possible, is indeed incumbent upon us, and is fruitful in inspiration and joy.[1]

Among the problems by which we are confronted is that of the relation between a historic event like the death of Christ and the effects attributed to it — effects, that is, which transcend the sphere and temporal limitations of the historical. How can what happens in time change relations and conditions which are not subject to temporal limitations? [2]

[1] Cf. J. S. Lidgett, pp. 4–6, 488–498; T. J. Crawford, Pt. IV. § iv; R. W. Dale, pp. 5–19.

[2] G. B. Stevens, Pt. III. ch. x, treats Christ's death as only a revelation of a process which is not tied to one event. So also A. H. Strong, *Syst. Theol.*, Vol. II. p. 715 (f).

The difficulty of reckoning with this problem can be seen to grow largely out of our inability to picture or describe the eternal aspect of the relations involved. We cannot describe effects of any kind except in temporal terms, because our experience gives no other terms with which to describe anything. But if we are Christian theists at all, we accept the following truths: (*a*) that all temporal effects have their ultimate explanation in eternal causation, although how an eternal cause can produce temporal results we can neither explain nor imagine; (*b*) that God has given to us a very real, although limited, power to modify temporal events — events, that is, which are to be explained in ultimate analysis by eternal causation, — so that human actions do in fact have indirect effect upon the eternal; (*c*) that human sin modifies for the worse the relations existing between us and God — relations which do not less truly impinge, so to speak, on the eternal centre of things because their visible and describable aspects are temporal. If this is so, no rational obstacle of the kind we are considering remains to the belief that such an act as the self-sacrificing death of Jesus Christ may modify the relations between us and God for the better.

But there is more to be said. The death of Christ, even though endured in human nature and under temporal conditions, is more than these conditions describe. It is an act of the eternal Son of God, fulfilled in obedience to the will of the eternal Father.

Its effect in the eternal sphere is therefore not to be estimated exclusively with reference to its being a temporal or historical event. It represents a movement, so to speak, of the eternal, whereby temporal events are utilized to rectify relations between the temporal and the eternal. The cause which operates in the redemption is therefore not simply historical, but also and primarily eternal and divine. It operates in time, and under temporal limitations, because it has to do with relations that concern the temporal as well as the eternal, and because it is designed to persuade human minds and enlist human wills, and this requires that the divine act shall take a form apprehensible by human understandings.[1]

The eternal aspect of the Cross also meets a difficulty which is often urged, that its effects can reach succeeding generations only, and that no benefits are afforded either for those who died before Christ came or for those who subsequently die but before the effects of His redeeming work are extended to them. An eternal act is not necessarily confined in its effects to the period in which, and previously to which, it takes form in time.[2] Only the manifestation of it, and the temporal inception of the persuasive and saving dispensation which it conse-

[1] Cf. H. R. Mackintosh, *Doctr. of the Person of Jesus Christ*, pp. 307–310. Cf. ch. x. § 6, below.

[2] Scripture teaches that the faithful under previous dispensations are redeemed and saved by Christ, being accepted by reason of their faith. See Heb. xi, esp. 39–40; St. Matt. viii. 11; St. Luke xiii. 28–29; Revel. xvii. 8. Cf. Revel. xiii. 8.

crates, is thus restricted.[1] The souls of the departed continue to exist, and we are not precluded from believing that beneficial effects will somewhere and somehow be realized by all who respond to the message of the Cross when it reaches them, even though such response becomes possible only in the other world.[2]

§ 6. Then there is the problem of personality. How, it is asked, can the act of one person affect the moral status of another person, except by way of external example personally imitated? It is the objective efficacy of Christ's death for other persons that is here at issue, rather than its moral influence, which is not disputed by any who acknowledge the moral splendour of the Cross.

Some have sought to solve this problem by denying the mutual impenetrability of persons. They seek to vindicate the directness and immediacy of the relations between Christ and the redeemed. But their choice of this method of handling the problem is often due to obliviousness of the New Testament method — its doctrine of the mystical Body, — and sometimes results in obscuring the permanent mutual distinctness of persons, their mutual otherness. In view of the fact that the divine Persons exist in each other, the contention that Christ's Person literally penetrates our persons so as to act within them, cannot be disproved, al-

[1] Cf. 1 St. Pet. i. 19–20; Gal. iv. 4; Eph. i. 10.
[2] Cf. 1 St. Pet. iii. 19–20. Cf. ch. v. § 9, below.

though it is not the formal meaning of St. Paul when he describes "Christ in us" as "the hope of glory." [1]

In any case, there can be no blending of persons, such as would nullify the distinct individuality and responsible integrity of each ego. Moreover, all the pertinent facts of human experience point to the conclusion that human spirits are invariably acted upon indirectly, and through the substantial and organic environment in which they live and through which they act. Even telepathy is thus conditioned, and we have no evidence that divine grace can operate in us except through what catholic theology terms our "nature," as distinguished from "person" or inner self. We are thus constituted by creation, and God never really violates the created constitution of things. His method is always to utilize, sometimes also to supplement, but never to stultify it. The immediate source of influences that change the attitude and status of the personal self is the nature or functional apparatus through which self acts, and by which it is conditioned. All observable data agree with this statement.

The maintenance of mutual integrity between persons is necessary for our continued personal responsibility, for personal immortality and for social relations. Because of our social nature our future bliss is based upon our living *with* Christ as well as *in* Him; and any real confusion of our personal

[1] Col. i. 27

identity with His would nullify this blessedness. The belief that we shall literally lose ourselves in God is akin to pantheism.

The New Testament does not afford a definitive solution of the problem which we are facing, but it does indicate where we are to look if we are to make any satisfactory advance towards its solution. The doctrine of Christ's mystical Body teaches us that, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, the human nature which Christ assumed, perfected by suffering and enthroned in the heavens, has become the medium of organic, quickening and sanctifying contact with us on His part. Through this contact He operates effectively on our persons, and through it we effectively respond to His grace, and personally identify ourselves with the death and resurrection whereby He has redeemed us. Accordingly, although He suffered apart from us, our mystical union with Him enables us to make our own what He has done, and to appropriate its benefits.[1] A more adequate and definitive explanation than this doctrine affords cannot be had.

§ 7. A third problem has to do with the value of physical suffering for a redemption from sin. Sin belongs to the moral and volitional sphere of things, and this sphere is so distinct from the physical that any attempt to describe its contents in physical terms results at best in metaphor. How then can physical suffering and death have the stupendous

[1] Cf. ch. iii. § 11, below.

moral and spiritual effects which are ascribed to the Cross? The pertinence of this question is enhanced when we bear in mind that some of these effects are described as objective — as achieved antecedently to any movement of human wills towards righteousness.[1]

In reckoning with this problem we have first to face the broad fact that, in spite of the radical nature of the difference between the physical and the moral, these two meet and interact in a most intimate way in human nature and experience. Human nature is not less a vital unit because its physical and spiritual elements are mutually discrete. Many human actions are both physical and moral. And every one of them, wherein conscious purpose is involved, that is, every moral act, is performed under physical conditions. This is true even of internal actions, such as thinking, and willing, in which the moral quality of human conduct has its source. And it is beyond intelligent denial that physical action — and often its precise form — not only has subjective influence upon subsequent determinations of the agent's will, but may in various ways hinder or help the moral decisions and actions of others, whether by example, by heredity or by external effects upon the physical conditions under which other men make their moral decisions. The broad fact that men constantly estimate human physical

[1] The question is helpfully discussed by Jas. Denney, *Atonement and the Modern Mind*, pp. 84–106.

actions by their moral effects upon others is surely of determinative significance in this argument.[1]

Then it has to be remembered that our Lord's endurance of death for us was voluntary, and therefore moral, not less so because He died at the hands of others. He did not commit suicide, nor was there any provocation on His part except faithfulness to perfect righteousness and to the messianic mission from God which He was obediently fulfilling.[2] In brief, His death was the climax and final consummation of an obedient life, and in this fact lies its meritorious quality. As will be shown in another connection, the fact that the Person who thus lived and died was divine gave to His achievement a value for others which transcends all that can rightly be ascribed to the most meritorious deeds or sufferings of any mere man.[3]

By way of reaction from a too exclusive emphasis upon Christ's death, a tendency has appeared to regard it as nothing more than an incidental element in His life — inevitable, no doubt, but not having in itself the formal place and value for redemption traditionally ascribed to it. As a result of this reaction, the point of emphasis in the doctrine of redemption has by certain writers been shifted from our Lord's death to His Incarnation and earthly life.[4]

[1] Cf. ch. iii. § 3, below. [2] Cf. pp. 12–13, above. [3] In ch. iii. § 5.

[4] It underlies Bishop Westcott's expositions and is prominent in Archd. Wilson's *Gospel of the Atonement*. The Calvinistic distinction between the active and passive obedience of Christ appears to contain a suggestion of this development. There can be no

So far as this tendency represents efforts to reëmphasize the antecedent necessity of the Incarnation, as enabling the Son of God to die for us, and various necessary conditions and aspects of His death, we ought most fully to sympathize with it. But the tendency has revealed a reactionary onesidedness of its own, and the biblical doctrine of the atonement has been modified in ways that have not only disturbed its revealed proportions, but have helped, along with other causes, to deaden men's sense of the awful consequences of sin and of the need of Christ's death for its remedy.

We may not forget that the Incarnation is to be postulated in our redemptive interpretation of Christ's death, and this postulate will be discussed in our next chapter. Nor may we neglect the truth that His earthly life of obedience to the Father's will imparts to His death its moral value.[1] But Scripture plainly fixes attention upon Christ's death, and subsequent victory over death, as the formal method by which human redemption has been achieved. To overlook this is to misinterpret the Gospel, to undermine significant elements in the dispensation of saving grace, and to reduce both the meaning and the appealing power of the Cross.

legitimate separation between the two. The active obedience was consummated in His death. See J. S. Lidgett, pp. 145–149.

[1] J. S. Lidgett's *op. cit.* is a fine exhibition of the spiritual principle of the atonement as consisting in the obedience which our Lord's death expressed and consummated. See esp. pp. 119–120 for a brief statement.

§ 8. A fourth problem arises from the disparity between universal redemption, said to be achieved once for all by Christ, and the extent of salvation, apparently confined to a minority of mankind. The doctrine of particular redemption has been eliminated, as inconsistent with the character of God; and the will of God to save all men has been acknowledged. If then the death of Christ has accomplished the redemption of all, why is the consequent dispensation of salvation less comprehensive in its results? Is the power of Christ to save less than His power to redeem? [1]

This problem is to some extent hypothetical, for we are in no position to dogmatize as to the number of the saved. What we really know is that the majority of men in the past have failed to be brought during their earthly lives within the sphere of the appointed means of salvation. God is not limited, as are the recipients of the Gospel, by the conditions of the covenant, in dealing with the ignorant; and we have convincing evidence that the work of the Holy Spirit is not confined to the mystical Body of Christ. Possibilities of saving knowledge and grace after death are also suggested by the fact that between His death and resurrection our Lord preached to the spirits in prison who had been disobedient

[1] This question is raised by W. A. Wright, *Problem of the Atonement*, pp. 49–51, 199–200. He of course fails to distinguish between redemption, which is the effect of the Cross, and salvation, which is a further mystery.

to the word of truth on earth.[1] The fact remains, however, that many do reject the Gospel under conditions of knowledge and hardening obstinacy which seem to preclude their future recovery; and the final judgment has to do with the disposition towards truth and righteousness shown in men's earthly lives. Moreover our Lord's teaching on the subject not only reveals the possibility, but implies the fact, that many will be lost.[2] The problem, therefore, is a real one, even after pessimistic exaggerations have been corrected.

In dealing with it we must distinguish between divine omnipotence and power to do all things. Power, as such, has no application, in fact no meaning, in relation to the impossible.[3] That God will save all whom it is possible to save may be reasonably inferred from His love; and we believe that no one will be lost who could have been saved.[4] But salvation includes as its determinative element recovery to righteousness, and this is plainly impossible except through a free response of men to saving grace, a factor depending in turn upon moral dispositions which no power can force.

Human freedom being presupposed, as it has to be in the attainment of moral salvation by men,

[1] 1 St. Pet. iii. 19–20.

[2] St. Matt. vii. 13–14; xxii. 13–14; St. Luke xiii. 23–30; xviii. 8.

[3] Cf. *Being and Attrib. of God*, pp. 277–278.

[4] See E. B. Pusey, *What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment*, pp. 7–18.

the possibility of such salvation is contingent. If God were to employ compulsion, He would not thereby save men to righteousness; and what is called irresistible grace is, in such connection at least, a misleading name for compulsion.[1] The power of men to choose carnal in preference to spiritual good, and to persevere in such choice, is a necessary part of their being moral agents; and long continued wilfulness may easily blind the spiritual perceptions of men to the point of hopeless incapacity to be enlightened and to be influenced by the motives which turn men's wills to God. The conclusion of the matter is that, if any man is lost beyond recovery, this is not due either to partiality in God's love or to defect in His power to do what can be done, but to conditions which can neither be prevented from arising nor be reversed by power extraneous to man himself.[2]

The case is different with the objective effects of Christ's victory over death, which do not include the personal salvation of individual men. On the contrary they are accomplished antecedently to, and independently of, men's moral response to the Gospel; and are limited to the establishment by God of the conditions under which salvation can be offered to men, and can be accomplished for those who

[1] Cf. *Creation and Man*, pp. 311, 342–343.

[2] For refutations of universalism, see E. B. Pusey, *op. cit.;* W. G. T. Shedd, *Doctrine of Everlasting Punishment;* R. W. Dale, Christian Doctrine, pp. 237–248.

rightly coöperate with saving grace. The work which Christ then achieved, required no coöperation by those for whom He died;[1] and, as a work of God for mankind, it makes salvation available to all. It is this universal availability of salvation accomplished by Christ's work which is meant when we speak of universal redemption — not the taking advantage of it by all men, upon which universal salvation depends.

III. *The Problem of Divine Love and Justice*

§ 9. We have yet to deal with the problems connected with the Godward aspects of our Lord's death.[2] They are at once the most central and the most difficult of all. But sufficient light is available to justify our confident acceptance of the New Testament interpretation of Christ's death as true.

There is the difficulty of understanding why a God whose nature is love should need to be propitiated by the Cross before He will forgive. The following dilemma illustrates this difficulty. If, on the one hand, God loved mankind before Christ died, the Cross was not needed to make Him propitious; but if, on the other hand, He had not been

[1] In this lies the element of truth which substitutionism exaggerates. Cf. ch. iv. § 4, below.

[2] On its relations to divine attributes, especially justice and love, see T. J. Crawford, pp. 421–455; Jas. Denney, *The Atonement and the Modern Mind*, ch. ii; J. S. Lidgett, pp. 155–170 (criticising R. W. Dale, Lec. ix) and ch. v. They are contributory rather than wholly satisfactory.

propitious already, He could not have been moved to send His Son to redeem us.[1]

It is assumed in this dilemma that "propitiation" and "reconciliation" mean a turning of God from vindictive resentment to loving mercy. But this is wrong. These terms are borrowed by New Testament writers from human analogies to describe a rectification of relations between the unalterably righteous, although not less the loving, God and His sinful creatures. But the only change of disposition which they signify is that of sinners. The relations which are rectified are mutual, it is true, and changes in the method of manifestation of God's love are involved in this rectification. But the sternest aspects of the Cross are revelations of love.

This view of the matter is not nullified by the fact that even the New Testament speaks of the wrath of God towards sinners,[2] and represents Him as exacting not only a full restoration of obedience to His will, but also an adequate sacrifice for sin.[3] Even in purely human relations wrath is consistent with love, and is often greatly intensified by it. In fact a careful consideration of the true meaning

[1] The argument of W. A. Wright, *Problem of the Atonement*, pp. 119–120. Cf. G. B. Stevens, pp. 427–430.

[2] *E. g.* Rom. i. 18; v. 9–10; Heb. x. 26–27; Revel. vi. 17. See *Being and Attrib. of God*, pp. 298, 306; St Thomas, I. iii. 2; Hastings, *Dic. of Bible*, *s. vv.* "Anger (Wrath) of God," "Hatred," "Jealousy"; R. W. Dale, pp. 338–351.

[3] Heb. ix. 11–28, and elsewhere.

of love shows that it lies at the root of all anger that is not purely vindictive.

Love is the desire for, and the joy in, personal relations.[1] No doubt it displays fruits of benevolence, of service and of forgiveness;[2] but it cannot fulfil itself, or gain real satisfaction for itself, except in the enjoyment of mutually congenial personal relations. It is not selfish, for the relations and joys that it seeks are mutual, and it is not really satisfied until each party to it imparts joy to the other.

Plainly such relations cannot be gained except on the basis of mutual congeniality of character, and a righteous person cannot enjoy them except with righteous persons. The fact is that, when its personal objects are human, love passes through a stage in which the elements of congeniality are potential rather than satisfyingly developed. Only when two persons reach perfect righteousness do they become entirely congenial to each other. Only then are the requirements of love fully satisfied. Until such consummation, human love is based upon men's faith in each other, that is, in the possibilities of congeniality, needing only to be cultivated in order to become actual. A mother's love for her troublesome child, and a Christian's love for his fellow men, are alike made possible by hopeful anticipation of congenial relations not yet developed.

[1] *Being and Attrib. of God*, pp. 301–303.

[2] It is often described in terms of such inevitable fruits and manifestations. Cf. 1 Cor. xiii.

Now wrath is a frequently observed and perfectly natural incident of love, that is, during the stages which precede its final and perfect actualization. The wrath of a lover is the attitude which he spontaneously assumes whenever the beloved one commits an act which is calculated to interrupt the development of the mutual congeniality to which love looks. Its intensity is due to the depth of the craving for mutual fellowship, which causes interfering acts to be regarded with correspondingly deep displeasure. And sincere forgiveness is always based upon belief that the barrier to the fulfilment of love's requirements has at least been put in the way of removal — this belief being caused either by the loved one's change of attitude or by faith in God's gracious work in his soul.

True love is patient, but is also exacting, for its necessary requirements cannot fully be satisfied until every defect of mutual congeniality has been remedied. And wrath is one of the inevitable ways in which love reveals its exacting nature. This wrath is inconsistent with righteousness only when it becomes vindictive, so as to make the lover unwilling to do his part in removing barriers. Unfortunately men usually allow their wrath to become vindictive, and thus to shorten their love; and this is why we find it hard to realize that God may be at once perfectly loving and sternly wrathful. Righteous wrath is not a failure of love, but grows out of it.

Another characteristic of righteous love is that it requires a man to be true to himself, that is to the higher self which he is seeking by God's will and help to make perfect. It looks to perfect righteousness as the only element in human character which can secure permanent and satisfying mutual congeniality. Accordingly, it moves men to those forms of self-sacrifice and service for others which help to develop in them the moral and spiritual perfection which they are seeking to acquire themselves. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

§ 10. The basis and the requirements of love which have been imperfectly set forth above are fundamental. They do not arise from anything distinctively human, but are involved in a true definition of love as such. Therefore the infinite perfection of God's love for sinners does not reduce their necessity, although His eternal nature, and His unique status as seat and source of righteousness for all, do determine the method in which His love manifests itself.

First of all, then, to say that God loves men means, if we use language strictly and correctly, that He wills to bring us into mutually congenial relations with Himself, relations which shall be pleasing to Him and joyous to us. The only possible basis of such relations, and of mutual pleasure in them, is perfect righteousness; and because He is not only our Maker, but also the eternal and immutable seat and source of righteousness, this basis can be secured only by

our development after His likeness. His will is determined by His righteous nature and reveals His righteousness.[1] Accordingly, our development in righteousness requires the entire conformity of our wills to his will, which He has revealed to us in sufficient measure for our guidance.[2]

Sin raises a barrier to the actualization of this love of God, a barrier which has to be removed, if its necessary requirements are to be fulfilled, and if its joy is to remain among possibilities. Whatever method of divine dealing is required for the removal of sin is therefore a *sine qua non* of divine love, if it is not to be untrue to the necessities of love. The attitude which lies behind the demand of divine love that human sin shall not prevent its consummation is called the wrath of God. It is not vindictive, not malicious or contrary to love, but is the inevitable form which righteous love assumes in the presence of interference with its requirements.[3]

God is not only loving, but is also benevolent; and His mercy is over all His rational creatures, regardless of their response to His love. Therefore we have reason to believe that He will bestow upon

[1] *Being and Attrib. of God*, pp. 296–299. God is our Father, and this fatherhood, if it is righteous, as it must be, constitutes a branch and mode of the love which actualizes itself by the development of the righteousness upon which congeniality between God and His creatures depends. Cf. J. S. Lidgett, pp. 229–233.

[2] *Creation and Man*, pp. 229–230. Cf. Rom. i. 17–23; St. Matt. v. 48; Eph. v. 1–2.

[3] Cf. pp. 70–71, above.

all men such good as they are capable of enjoying.[1] Even the misery of hell is relative to the higher blessings that have been lost, and is consistent with this belief. If God were not merciful to all, hell would be unendurable — which it plainly cannot be, if creatures survive in it. No human suffering, whether penal or not, is such that it cannot be truly regarded as springing from the limitations of the sufferers, and as entirely consistent with divine mercy. But divine love is distinct from divine mercy, in that it looks not only to human happiness, but to that highest form of joy which mutually pleasing relations between men and their Maker alone can produce. And these relations, as we have seen, cannot be enjoyed on any other basis than that of perfect righteousness. Divine love, therefore, has an exacting quality the measure of which is proportionate to love's splendour. It cannot become unconditioned beneficence and be true to itself.

To be true to itself love must require righteousness, as the necessary condition of its joy. This means that the love of God for men requires Him to be true to Himself, because to be true to Himself is for Him the same thing as to be true to righteousness. It is for the sake of love, therefore, that God must require sinners to come to terms with Himself. These considerations enable us to see that the dilemma above given is more specious than valid. God did

[1] *Being and Attrib. of God*, pp. 299–301.

love mankind before Christ's death, and it was because of this love that propitiation was needed. And whatever else the propitiatory aspect of the Cross may signify, it means a provision of divine love, a provision whereby our full enjoyment of it is made possible.

§ 11. This conclusion will be confirmed when we reckon with divine justice, to which the wrath of God, already spoken of, is also vitally related. So far as we are here concerned with it, divine justice means that moral attribute by reason of which God must in any case maintain, and, where sin occurs, vindicate, the requirements of righteousness.[1] He must do this because He cannot be untrue to Himself and because righteousness, as its very name indicates, is the principle upon the maintenance of which the universal order of things depends for self-coherence and for the fulfilment of its eternal purpose. The necessities of righteousness are absolute, and, as we have already seen, they are necessities of perfect love. Accordingly there is no opposition whatever between perfect love and perfect justice. The triumph of love depends absolutely upon the triumph of justice, because the mutual congeniality which love inevitably seeks, and by which alone it can attain its goal, is inchoate in relation to sinners until they have been brought into entire alignment with perfect righteousness.

The necessity that God should be controlled by

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 297–299.

justice is not, however, an external necessity, as if it were something prior to and higher than God Himself. The seat and source of righteousness and justice is God Himself. Righteousness apart from Him is an unreal abstraction. The necessity is internal, and consists in the law that God must be true to Himself — must be God. Upon His being eternally what He is depends the existence and maintenance of the universe, and therefore also the existence and operation of its highest element, viz. the very reason wherewith we consider the problem before us. The conclusion to which this internal relation between God and righteousness points is that, although we can distinguish in thought between God's vindication of righteousness and His self-vindication, we cannot separate them. They are two aspects of one and the same necessary law of His dealing with sinners.

Moreover, God is not a private person among other personal beings, but is one upon whose moral supremacy and self-vindication depends the whole moral order — the order, that is, to which finite persons have to conform in order to attain to self-realization. It follows that God's self-vindication is not a display of what is meant by the term selfishness. It is, indeed, self-centred; but apart from it moral chaos must rule, and everything that makes human life worth living must be fatally undermined. The triumph of righteousness in the universe depends upon the self-vindication of God; and, as has been

shown, divine love cannot triumph unless righteousness triumphs.

In fact the self-vindication of God, divine justice, reveals itself in two ways. In the first place God has so constituted this universe that the way of the sinner is hard, deprived of all real satisfaction, and grows more miserable as the sinner becomes more wedded to sinful habit. In brief, God punishes sin, and there is no escape from this law. It is unquestionably true that the method of punishment is determined by love, being of such nature as to turn men to righteousness so that they can finally enjoy the blessedness of love, and of congenial fellowship with Him, to which true human love looks. But this curative aspect of the sinner's misery does not remove its penal aspect while it lasts, nor can punishment reach its term while sinfulness remains. The possibility that it may remain permanently can be denied only on the assumption that human wills can be converted by compulsion and remain true wills — a false assumption.

In the second place, God is revealed as vindicating Himself by exacting personal and voluntary reparation for sin, and this requirement is signified in the New Testament by such symbols as "sacrifice for sin" and "propitiation."[1] If we can trust the teaching which these symbols convey, accomplished sin is repaired, neither in itself nor in its Godward effects, by mere repentance; and this teaching is

[1] On which, see ch. iv. §§ 5, 8, below.

confirmed by the human conscience. No truly penitent sinner can fully clear his conscience without offering some voluntary reparation to the violated majesty of God. And an impenitent sinner is not a competent judge in such a matter. The Christian doctrine of atonement teaches that the death of Christ is the act of God-incarnate by which He graciously enables us to offer sufficient reparation. Sin is not merely a deviation from righteousness, considered in the abstract, and which can be remedied by simply again conforming thereto. It is a personal break with Him in whom righteousness has its seat and source. And this break cannot be closed up in an indirect and impersonal way. Personal reconciliation with God is love's demand, and is a vital aspect of rectifying sin.[1] And this is not a proof of divine vindictiveness, but is the method by which personal offenses have to be repaired, if personal relations are once more to be what they should be for those who have offended.

The fact that God has ever been ready to forgive sinners, and that immediately upon repentance, is perfectly consistent with this necessity. Divine forgiveness does not of itself complete human recovery, but puts men on a footing which enables them to benefit by Christ's death, and, *on the basis of it*, to work out their salvation. The conditions of salvation, which that death enables us to meet, are

[1] Cf. ch. i. § 1, above. See Wm. Magee, *The Atonement*, app. iv–v; R. W. Dale, pp. 373–397.

unaltered by forgiveness and unalterable, since they are based upon eternal necessities of righteousness as seated in a personal God. God's forgiveness presupposes the Cross,[1] whereby satisfactory reparation has been made, and is immediately based upon the fact that by repenting, men show the disposition which leads them to identify themselves with Christ in His death.

§ 12. Inasmuch as the method by which God has enabled us to meet the necessities above considered is in fact the sending of His own Son to die for us, this method, simply because it is His, may be regarded as undeniably satisfying the requirements both of love and of justice. And it is not to be viewed as an ingenious means of balancing mutually opposed requirements, but as entirely loving and entirely just. As we have seen, perfect love and perfect justice stand and fall together, and the requirements of each and of both are in ultimate bearing the same.

That the Cross displays the love of God for men, and makes a powerful appeal to sinners on this account,[2] is so readily perceived that this aspect of it has received too exclusive attention from many modern writers, with unfortunate results. The frightful cost of our Lord's appeal to men is apparent when

[1] It is presupposed in the parable of the prodigal son, unless either our Lord's teaching was inconsistent, or He was hopelessly misunderstood by apostolic writers.

[2] This is reckoned with in ch. iv. §§ 11–12, below.

we consider the Cross in its full context, and this affords proof of the depth and intensity of His love. Moreover the redeeming significance of this love appears when we reckon with His Person. His death was the death of God-incarnate, and the unique agony of it was borne by the very Being against whom we have sinned. The cost which Christ bore was then the cost that God was willing to bear, in order that He might recover His rebellious children, save them from sin, and reconcile them to Himself. [1]

But this costliness reveals the exacting, as well as the appealing, side of divine love, a fact which is often disregarded. There is a law of parsimony in divine operations which forbids that God should do more than is necessary for the fulfilment of His purposes. Excessive action, disproportionate to the end in view, is foreign to divine methods. If God-incarnate died for sinners, therefore, it must have been because nothing less costly than such a death could avail for restoring the conditions under which love can actualize its blessed joy as between the righteous God and those who have sinned.

In revealing and meeting the exacting demands of divine love, the Cross also reveals and satisfies divine justice; for, although these aspects are distinct in meaning, they are inseparable in working. The maintenance and vindication of righteousness, with which divine justice is concerned, is also, we

[1] On the meaning of divine impassibility in this connection, see pp. 95–96, below.

have seen, the maintenance and vindication of the conditions of mutual congeniality between God and man, upon which depends the joyful fruition of mutual love between them.

How does Christ's death meet the requirements of divine justice? We have for several reasons repudiated the explanation that it constitutes the punishment of sin.[1] It was not endured by sinners, and does not in fact exempt them from punishment while they remain sinful. To Christ it was not penal at all, but a voluntary act of sacrifice. It was reparative rather than penal, and in this particular St. Anselm came nearer to the truth than the reformers. But no full explanation of the manner in which Christ's death meets the requirements of justice is possible. The mystery is too profound to be wholly revealed. But Holy Scripture does contain truths which throw some light on the problem. Such elaboration of them as is possible in this volume will be undertaken in the fourth chapter. Only two leading thoughts can here be given.

Redemption from sin, without which reconciliation to God is a vain illusion, requires death. "Without shedding of blood is no remission." [2] The reason seems to be that divine forgiveness necessarily postulates the cure of sinfulness, an evil which is so deeply ingrained that only the surgery of death can

[1] In § 2 of this chapter.

[2] Heb. ix. 22. Cf. Levit. xvii. 11. The life, forfeited by sin, is in the blood.

finally remove it. But the death of a sinner is fatal, unless death itself can be overcome. By His death and resurrection Christ overcame death, and because of His uniting in Himself the divine source of immortality and a Manhood at once sinless and capable of being imparted to us, He has become the Firstfruits of them that are asleep.

Then too Christ's death is an acceptable sacrifice to God for sin. It is so pleasing to Him in its splendid moral and spiritual significance that it constitutes a full reparation to His violated majesty. Morover the identification of Christ with sinners, which His catholic Manhood makes possible, and which is achieved through His mystical Body, gives vicarious value to His sacrifice for all who fulfil their part in working out their salvation.

These thoughts are merely contributory to the solution of the problem, and cannot be fully worked out by human minds. But they are valid inferences from the Word of God, and they reasonably fortify our belief in the objective and Godward effects of Christ's death and victory over death.

CHAPTER III

THEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

I. *Anthropological*

§ 1. The doctrine of our Lord's death involves that of His resurrection; and both are related to a larger Christian scheme, and cannot be rightly understood when viewed apart from the whole of that scheme.[1] Many of the misconceptions which have reduced the value of theories of the atonement have arisen from forgetfulness of this. This chapter is designed to prevent our falling into the same forgetfulness.

It should be clear that man's destiny and nature need to be borne in mind in interpreting the means whereby he is redeemed from sin, and that the destiny which God has willed for him has determined the nature which He has given him. This destiny is to enjoy a free personal fellowship with his Maker, in a social order and kingdom in which all things, whether visible or invisible, minister to the rule of righteousness and love. The saying of St. Augustine, "Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless until they find rest in Thee, O God,"

[1] Cf. L. Ragg, pp. 3–7.

sums up the central element in our destiny and its determinative effect upon our nature.[1]

Such a destiny can be enjoyed only by free, rational and moral agents, agents between whom and God there can be developed the mutual spiritual congeniality of character upon which the enjoyment of fellowship necessarily depends. And the character which man needs for the production of this mutual congeniality is, of course, determined by the character of God. This is so not only because we are His creatures, and can attain to our destiny only on lines appointed by Him, but also because His character is changeless. The mutual enjoyment of fellowship between us and God depends, therefore, upon what we become, upon the assimilation of our characters to His. And our nature is determined by this necessity, making us capable, under conditions to which our next section refers, of developing after His likeness.[2]

We are free as Christian believers to accept the present conclusion of biologists that the method of human nature's origin, on its physical side at least, is that of evolution — of variation in lower forms of organic life, of segregation, of heredity, and of survival of the fittest. Even if the beginnings of moral development are more ancient than the human, we need not abandon the truth that the "creative push" which explains the long process, and has

[1] On human destiny, see *Creation and Man*, chh. vi. §§ 9–12; vii. § 11.

[2] Cf. pp. 71, 73, above.

controlled its results, is divine. And man is the distinctive creature that he is, made for a destiny peculiar to himself, whatever may have been the method of his creation.[1]

Human freedom, finite though it be, is plainly necessary, if man is to develop the character required for his destined enjoyment of God; and God cannot disregard it in dealing with him without abandoning His purpose — an impossibility. It follows that the keynote of divine government of man, even in its most objective aspects, is persuasion; and persuasion can be resisted to the end by moral agents.[2] Moreover, the subjective motives which determine finite wills are not fixed *ab initio* in the direction of righteousness; and they are contingent in moral result upon the reflex effect of free choices and of the habits which these choices create. This is but another way of saying that human character is to a degree the fruit of self-determined moral development, requiring time to complete. And our experience affords no basis for imagining any other method of God's fulfilment of His purpose for man than one which involves, a period of probation and the possibility of sin, and which includes moral as well as objective means for its remedy.

§ 2. But, although man is a free agent, and made capable of being developed after the divine likeness,

[1] Cf. *Creation and Man*, ch. vi. §§ 1–2; *Evolution and the Fall*, pp. 95–108; H. Calderwood, *Evolution and Man's Place in Nature*.

[2] Cf. *Creation and Man*, pp. 327–328.

he is not self-sufficient for such development; but is naturally dependent upon present relations with God, and upon divine assistance. There are obvious reasons for this. In the first place, the relations with God for which we are made do not, and cannot, place us on equal terms with Him. They are based upon our conformity to Him, not less so because this conformity must be free on our part. And no such conformity is possible, unless our development is guided by that knowledge of Him which is derived from personal relations with Him. Again, the conditions of human probation are liable to draw us away from God, unless our very nature gives us a sense of dependence upon His presence and assistance. Finally, our moral and spiritual development is part of our making, and God is our Maker — not less so because He wills to enlist our participation in the later stages of His work.[1]

So it is that man is by nature a religious being. This means that he naturally depends upon and aspires after relations with God, wherein religion consists. In his more degraded states, he aspires blindly and tries to satisfy his religious cravings by "gods many," and by other misguided attempts to adjust himself to the unseen. But his moral and spiritual advancement is signalized, and made successful as well, by more and more determinate and authentic relations with his Maker, the one true God for whom he is made.[2]

[1] *Creation and Man*, pp. 253–255, 263–264, 267–270; *Evolution and the Fall*, pp. 167–172. [2] *Creation and Man*, ch. vii. §§ 1–4.

This law dominates all human history, and explains why it is, as Christian doctrine teaches, that the divine factor must operate not only in the original and sinless stage of human existence, constituting a primitive state of grace, but also in the interrupting conditions of human sin. Sin has indeed set back human development, and its utter removal is for each and every man a *sine qua non* of his success in reaching his appointed destiny. Sin not only sets back human development, but disturbs the relations with God upon which its continuance depends. Religion is therefore modified by sin; that is, has come to be conditioned by special mercies of God, such as are afforded by the entrance into history of God-incarnate, by His redeeming death and victory over death, and by the Christian dispensation of saving grace.

§ 3. Human nature is composite, made up of matter and spirit, and human spirits can neither act nor experience anything in this world except under conditions afforded by the bodily organism. This organism is in turn part of a larger realm of matter, between which and our spirits it is the connecting link. When the human spirit is out of gear with its bodily organism, and with the material world to which this organism belongs, we describe the situation by saying that the man is ill. And when the spirit's connection with the body is ruptured we describe the man as dead. Experience reveals no instance in which this dependence of our spirits upon matter for

receiving impressions and for expressing themselves is transcended.[1] Such is human nature so far as we know it, and we are driven to the conclusion that the spiritual aspects of man's life, and therefore of its Godward relations, are to be found not in the banishment of the external and material, but in their subjection to spiritual uses and purposes. The whole meaning of matter would seem to be that it is made for spirit,[2] and is therefore not contrary to it, unless our spirits fail to use it rightly. This failure occurs whenever we sin, and sin is the true explanation of the existing fact that the flesh lusteth contrary to the spirit.

Moreover, this function of matter is not, according to Christian doctrine, confined to the earthly and probationary stage of human existence. Human immortality is realized by a restoration of the connection between the spirit and its body; and in this restoration, accompanied as it is by a mysterious change and development of the body for more perfect spiritual use, the resurrection of the dead consists. The resurrection of the body is the condition of Christian immortality, and of the larger life of our spirits in the world to come.[3]

It is thus that God made us, and His dealings with us are necessarily determined in method by

[1] *Creation and Man*, pp. 190–193.

[2] See J. R. Illingworth, *Divine Immanence*, chh. i–ii.

[3] See ch. vii. §§ 9–12, below. The subject will recur in our concluding volume on *Eschatology*.

what He made us to be. Inasmuch as our spirits can experience nothing except through objective movements of the external and material, it is through external historical events that God reveals Himself to us. And His operations upon our spirits, which we call divine grace, are always mediated in this life through our organisms. When our conscious laying hold of grace is required, He makes use of external *media*, such as human spirits can apprehend. The same law holds in our response to divine grace. The brain, at least, conditions all our thoughts and all our prayers; and we cannot adequately express ourselves whether to God or to man, except through bodily actions and external demonstrations. This is the principle which explains sacramental elements of religion, and it cannot be disregarded without religious disaster.[1]

The whole drama of redemption and salvation is controlled by this irreversible law of human experience and self-expression. Redemption is revealed and mediated through historic actions, externally observable by men and verifiable by the historical method — these actions including chiefly the Incarnation, the death of Christ, His resurrection from the grave and bodily ascension, and the descent of the Holy Spirit in cloven tongues of fire. The mystical

[1] Cf. p. 296, below. The sacramental principle will be considered in our next volume. But see Morgan Dix, *Sacramental System*, Lecs. i–ii; A. J. Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, ch. ix. § 3; J. R. Illingworth, *op. cit.*, ch. vi; P. B. Bull, *The Sacramental Principle*.

Body of Christ has been constituted as a visible Church and the rallying place for the redeemed;[1] and the sacramental system of the Church affords authentic and apprehensible *media* through which the benefits of redemption are appropriated and saving grace is imparted to us.

§ 4. Finally, man is by nature a social being. In no department of his life and conduct is it good for him to be alone. Solitary confinement is the road to insanity, and even voluntary isolation reduces a man's efficiency and capacity for development. We are made social by nature because we are made for fellowship with God, in whose tri-personal life the absolute norm and perfection of fellowship is eternally actualized. Being made one and all for such fellowship, we are necessarily made for fellowship with each other, and our social development here is a necessary part of our preparation for the social life yonder, apart from which human persons can neither fully actualize their potential capacities nor entirely satisfy their natural cravings.[2]

This is why love is the controlling and perfecting element of righteousness; and this explains the ecstatic joy which attends the love of man and maid, before the imperfections of earthly congenialities have had time to reveal their presence under the testing conditions of married life. That this ecstasy should be felt is part of a divine dispensation which makes marriage attractive, and constitutes the

[1] See § 11 of this chapter. [2] *Creation and Man*, ch. vii. § 7.

family to be the earthly social unit. It is, indeed, the appointed means not only of protecting our present social life from subversion, but also of promoting the earthly side of our social development.

Men's social destiny also accounts for the fact that God deals with them under social conditions and requirements. No man's relations with God are permitted to become a purely private affair. Every divine covenant is made with a people or congregation, the internal harmony and social unity of which is protected by organization and institutions of divine appointment. In the covenant, the relations of individuals to God are fostered and developed in and through the social arrangements and relations of the people or Church with which the covenant is made. The working of such a dispensation may be hindered by the shortcomings of those to whom its earthly ordering is delegated, but no substitute for God's social instrument can avail. The remedy lies through reformatory movements within the Church, not through man-made substitutes.

How vital this doctrine is appears when we consider that God has united in one dispensation the Church's organization and the sacramental ministrations of grace and Eucharistic worship. He has done so because our social nature and destiny necessarily determine the manner in which our relations to Him can be secured and developed.

It is a branch of this social method that God makes every man dependent upon the ministrations of

others in things divine. There is but one Mediator in whose Person God and man are united; but the mediation of Christ has always utilized the ministrations of men in His name; and the orderly working of this method has been secured by ministerial organization of the Church, begun by Christ and completed by His apostles, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

The Redeemer came to the existing Church of God. And out of Jewry He selected the nucleus of the Church which He purchased with His own blood, and to which He draws those who submit to be saved by His life. It is through this Church, which the Holy Spirit has made to be Christ's mystical Body, that men become mystically identified with the Redeemer, and under its socially ordered conditions enjoy the benefits of His death and resurrection.[1]

II. *Christological*

§ 5. We cannot rightly understand the doctrine of Christ's death if we fail to reckon either with the Person of the Redeemer, with His earthly life, with His resurrection, or with His heavenly priesthood.

The doctrine of Christ's Person has been treated of in the next previous volume of this series. The particulars which bear on our present subject are especially two: (*a*) Jesus Christ is the eternal Son and Word of God, coëssential and coëqual with the

[1] These subjects will be more fully treated in the next volume.

Father, and possessed of the fulness of the Godhead, so that all which He taught and did and suffered, was taught and done and endured by very God;[1] (*b*) This divine Person assumed a human nature like ours, although sinless, making His own eternal Self to be its Ego and individuating principle, and thus enabling it to transcend the limitations of human individuals, without preventing it from being truly human and subject to the laws of human experience and growth.[2]

It was this union in His Person of divine agency with human methods of action and experience that enabled Him to teach in human terms, but with divine authority; to set a human example, which would none the less be that of God, and would reveal His moral and spiritual character; and to endure human agony with redemptive effects, exceeding the power of creatures to achieve.

The human side of our Lord's self-manifestation and experience is not to-day seriously questioned; but in "liberal" circles there has for some time been an increasing tendency either to deny, or to disregard the practical bearing of, the doctrine of His full Godhead. The result has been to reduce the acknowledged significance of His death to that of an individual man. This in turn has accentuated the modern reaction from belief in objective atonement, since it leaves no reasonably credible basis for the vicarious element in that doctrine.

[1] *The Incarnation*, ch. iv. [2] *Op. cit.*, ch. v.

The bearings of the ecclesiastical and biblical doctrine of our Lord's Person on the doctrine of redemption and salvation [1] are chiefly the following:

(*a*) In general the entire redemptive work of Christ is, personally speaking, the work of God, and has values, meanings and effects which divine agency alone can explain.

(*b*) The Incarnation enabled God to endure human suffering and death, and thus to experience human difficulties and to carry human sorrows. This is so because the Godhead is not susceptible of human suffering; and our Lord's passion was endured in His Manhood alone. Yet what He thus endured was endured by God, because His Person was not less divine by reason of His assumption of our nature, and His experiences in His Manhood were not less truly His by reason of His being personally divine.

The doctrine of divine impassibility has sometimes been denied under misapprehension of its meaning. It does not mean that there is no basis for the biblical ascriptions to God of love and anger, of joy and grieving, and the like.[2] It means that these terms,

[1] On which, see *The Incarnation*, pp. 120–124; H. P. Liddon, *Divinity of our Lord*, pp. 480–487; H. V. S. Eck, *Incarnation*, ch. x; R. L. Ottley, *Incarnation*, pp. 314–315; H. R. Mackintosh, *Doctr. of the Person of Jesus Christ*, pp. 329–333; J. S. Lidgett, ch. viii.

[2] Cf. the unguarded protests against excluding God Himself from feeling made by H. Bushnell, *Vicarious Sacrifice*, Vol. I. pp. 223 *et seq.;* G. B. Stevens, pp. 443–446. For a traditional statement, also incomplete, see Bp. Pearson, *Apos. Creed*, fol. 187–188. Cf. R. L. Ottley, *op. cit.*, Vol. II. p. 85; H. M. Relton, in *Ch. Qly. Review*, July, 1917, art. on "Patripassianism."

borrowed as they are from the analogies of finite and temporal experience, are symbolical, and describe affections (*sic*) in God which transcend in mode every temporal process and experience. If God was to suffer *after the human manner*, He had to make human nature His own.

(*c*) The obedience of Christ was that of a divine Person, and had the meritorious value which divine agency imparts to it. Consequently the merit of His passion was also divine, and infinitely higher in quality than that of any human person, however perfect. In saying this, however, we need to eliminate quantitative descriptions, for it was not the quantitative aspects of His works and sufferings that gave them their supereminent value, but their perfect moral quality and their divine agency. If we speak of His merits as superabundant we should not mean that they outmeasure in quantity the requirements of reparation for human sin, but that their moral and qualitative value transcends that of all purely human actions and experiences whatsoever.[1]

(*d*) The objective efficacy of our Lord's death and victory is also divine, and what He did and suffered is sufficient both for its Godward purpose and for its universal human application. The Father will certainly accept what the eternal Son has achieved in obedience to His will, and the eternal nature of the

[1] Cf. p. 48, above. On the value of Christ's death, see J. S. Lidgett, pp. 385–386, 393–397.

will thus fulfilled brings every generation of our race within the range of its benefits.

(*e*) The fact that the Manhood in which Christ suffered is that of a divine Person emancipates it from the limitations of human individualization, and makes it catholic in experience and capacity to be communicated to men at large. Upon this fact is based the quickening and saving possibilities which are actualized in the mystical Body of Christ, of which something more is to be said in this chapter.[1] A realization of these possibilities is needed to protect the vicarious aspect of our Lord's death from substitutional caricature.

§ 6. The death of Christ cannot be correctly understood apart from the earthly life which led up to it; and forgetfulness of this is one of the factors which have imparted to the so called "orthodox" doctrine of post-reformation days its repellent onesidedness. The present danger, however, lies in the opposite direction, in the tendency to reduce the significance of Christ's death as itself constituting the formal method of redemption. The function of our Lord's life in relation to redemption was twofold.[2] It supplied the human side of His equipment as Redeemer, and it afforded a needed opportunity for Him to fulfil certain ends that are contributory to our salvation.

(*a*) Our Lord's human equipment as Redeemer

[1] In § 11. Cf. *The Incarnation*, pp. 134–137.

[2] On the redemptive aspects of our Lord's earthly life, see A. J. Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, ch. vi. §§ 12–17.

was acquired partly by His becoming Man, and partly by His successful endurance of temptation. The Incarnation, as we have seen, enabled our Lord to endure the human death wherein His act of redemption historically consists, and also to practice obedience to the law for man. This obedience contributed to His equipment by making Him a meritorious sufferer, in whom the devil could find nothing whereby either to enslave Him or to divert Him from His redemptive mission. The suffering by which He was made perfect Redeemer, and after His victory over death became Author of our salvation, included the actualization, in terms of human experience, and under the conditions of painful temptation, of the moral perfections which were already latent in Him. They were latent in Him, for God-incarnate could not fail to practice righteousness at whatever cost of human effort on His part; but their actualization required, none the less, the temptations and difficulties by which He was tested and approved.[1]

(*b*) Our Lord's earthly life afforded Him the opportunity of accomplishing things which had to be done, if the benefits of His redemptive work were to be successfully communicated, and if men's salvation was to be facilitated.

1. In the first place, He was able to teach, by word of mouth, by significant works, and by example, the mysteries of His kingdom, the fundamental

[1] See *The Incarnation*, pp. 246–259, 340–342. H. R. Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, pp. 400–406; J. S. Lidgett, ch. vi.

meaning of His death in relation thereto, and the moral conditions which must be fulfilled by those who would be saved. It is true that, until His death and resurrection had afforded an illuminating standpoint for His disciples, He could not teach all that He had to say, and that His teaching was filled out by the Holy Spirit. But what He did say to them constituted, in the light of accomplished redemption, a basis of their growth in knowledge which was both necessary and sufficient.

2. In the second place, He selected, trained and commissioned His apostles, as the nucleus and first ministers of the Church,[1] which the Holy Spirit was to quicken and to make to be His mystical body. And He instituted its primary sacraments at least, thus providing the means by which the quickening and saving grace of His body was to be imparted to and developed in His members.

3. Finally, He gave the kind of example which is required for the ultimate guidance of Christian conduct and growth.[2] It was not an exclusively human example, but also divine; for human destiny, as has been shown in this chapter,[3] requires our imitation of God. It was not an example to which we can immediately rise, but exhibits the goal of human development, a goal which we can attain only by

[1] *The Incarnation*, pp. 342–343; A. B. Bruce, *Training of the Twelve;* Hastings, *Dic. of Christ*, *s. v.* "Apostles."

[2] *The Incarnation*, ch. viii (where other refs. are given on p. 260); *Kenotic Theory*, ch. vi. [3] In § 1.

life-long growth and stumbling practice in the use of the mighty power by which He won His moral victories. But it is not a purely external example, nor a baffling one; for His redemption and saving priesthood issue in a union between Him and us which makes His moral strength available to us, that is, as rapidly as we learn by self-discipline to use it.

The conclusion which needs again to be asserted is that, while our Lord's earthly life was a needed preamble to and preparation for His achievement of redemption, the formal and historical method of redemption was His death and victory over death.

§ 7. The resurrection of our Lord will be considered in several later chapters of this volume; but this chapter will not be formally complete unless the dependence of the doctrine of Christ's death upon that of the resurrection is at least indicated and emphasized.

There is a peculiarly close connection between these two mysteries, and in turn between them and the antecedent mystery of the Incarnation. If our Lord had not become incarnate, He could not have died for us; and if He had not really died, His resurrection from the dead could not have taken place. On the other hand, His resurrection had to take place, if the purpose for which He became incarnate was to be advanced towards its fulfilment; and if He had not risen, the despair which the apostles felt after His crucifixion would have been justified by the

event, for redemption would not have been achieved. As St. Paul declares, we should have been dead in our sins. Such a fatal termination of our Lord's mission was, indeed, incredible; for the eternal Son of God could not be holden of death.[1]

The sum of what is here said is that, although it is customary and justifiable to speak of Christ's death as the means of our redemption, since it is the determinative aspect of that mystery, His victory over death was the *sine qua non* of its being redemptive. His resurrection completed redemption, and is always to be presupposed when we speak of our having been redeemed by His death.[2] It is through the resurrection that the death of Christ becomes the basis and consecration of His ever living priesthood, through which in turn its benefits become available to us in the dispensation of salvation.

§ 8. The heavenly priesthood of Christ will also be dealt with in the last chapter of this volume; but, as in the case of the resurrection, it also needs to be referred to here as being a vital part of the interpretative context of the doctrine of His death.

The Epistle of the Hebrews bears ample witness to the dependence of our Lord's heavenly priesthood upon His death, but is equally emphatic in exhibiting the necessity of His ever-continuing priesthood for the living value of His death for sinners. It is through

[1] Acts ii. 24.

[2] Cf. ch. viii. § 7. See L. Pullan, ch. viii. § 3 and pp. 203–204; B. F. Westcott, *Gospel of the Resurrection*, pp. 122–129.

the living and glorified Lord that the time which separates us from His death is bridged; and it is through His present ministry in the heavens that His death lives on, as it were, and transcends in its abiding effect the limitations under which passing events of by-gone ages have to be regarded in historical science. Christ's present appearing for us and heavenly intercession constitute the means by which His death continues to avail with God for sinners; and the dispensation of salvation which His death makes possible depends for its abiding efficacy upon His present heavenly work as the Author of salvation.

What we are asserting is of the utmost importance in maintaining the credibility of the objective aspects of the doctrine of the atonement. A mere historic event can hardly be thought to have the effects ascribed in the New Testament to the death of Christ; and the neglect of continuing priesthood, which has characterized protestant theology, has much to do with the discredit into which its doctrine of objective atonement has fallen.[1] While belief in ministerial priesthood in the Church has been carefully retained by catholic theologians, they too, in many instances, have reduced the credibility both of this doctrine and of the doctrine of objective atonement by failing to exhibit their necessary connecting link, which is

[1] W. Milligan, *Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood*, Note B, pp. 340–366, seems to realize this. Cf. W. J. S. Simpson, pp. 143–155; P. B. Bull, pp. 80–83.

our Lord's heavenly priesthood. This defect is especially apparent in many treatises on the Eucharistic sacrifice.

III. *Soteriological*

§ 9. The New Testament teaches that, although Christ gave His life "a ransom for many," and "we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son," [1] His death did not then and there save us. It was after His death that Christ "became unto all them that obey Him the Author of eternal salvation," and we are "saved by His life." [2] Moreover, our salvation is neither an instantaneous event, nor a process which is completed independently of our co-operation; for we have to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling, although we cannot do this except God also worketh in us "both to will and to work, for His good pleasure." [3]

Our salvation, then, is a present work of grace. It is, of course, based upon Christ's death; but it is accomplished in a dispensation which is clearly distinct from that mystery, and which requires for its success the believing coöperation of men. The distinction between redemption and salvation, between what was accomplished by our Lord's death and resurrection and the dispensation of salvation which these events validate without making unnecessary, this distinction is of the utmost importance for a correct understanding of the doctrine of the atonement.

[1] St. Matt. xxviii. 20; St. Mark x. 45; Rom. v. 10–11.
[2] Heb. v. 9; Rom. v. 10. [3] Phil. ii. 12–13.

Unfortunately it has been very widely overlooked and disregarded; and the result has been a tendency to make the doctrine of the atonement do duty for that of salvation. This has led many theologians to ascribe excessive effects to Christ's death, and seriously to reduce the credibility of their theology of it. To interpret the death of Christ as accomplishing all that certain "orthodox" writers ascribe to it, and to maintain that salvation is once for all achieved for each individual by his divinely engendered faith in the Cross, is to make the doctrine of the atonement appear justly open to the charge now frequently made against it — of exhibiting the death of Christ as a non-moral and automatic species of magic, more stultifying to human intelligence than helpful to those who need guidance in turning to God and saving their souls.

§ 10. Redemption, here used as signifying the objective effects of Christ's death and resurrection, is not salvation, but removes certain barriers to it, and is the antecedent condition of it. The doctrine of the Cross presupposes, as part of its context, the dispensation of saving grace; but as subsequently to be actualized and not as part of itself. As interpreted in the New Testament, the death of Christ has to do in its objective aspects with vicarious fulfilment of the expiatory conditions of salvation, and with perfecting the medium of saving grace, — this medium being the glorified body of the risen Lord. The following New Testament symbols, or sound words,

represent leading particulars, the formal exposition of which belongs to the next chapter.

(*a*) By His death the Redeemer gave His life a *ransom for many*, whereby He purchased the Church with His blood, and redeemed us from slavery to sin and from the power of its author, the devil.

(*b*) He made the one full, perfect and sufficient *sacrifice for sin*, whereby His ever-living priesthood and oblation for us in the heavens is consecrated, and made to be the permanent basis and medium of acceptable human approach and self-oblation to God.

(*c*) He shed His blood for the *remission of sins*, thereby providing a means of *cleansing*, and constituting Himself to be the *propitiation* for our sins.

(*d*) He also died that He might *overcome death*, and through death become the source of life for His redeemed. Death is for contrite sinners the way to immortality, but it is His victory over death, and our union with Him, that makes it this; and He has become "the Firstfruits of them that are asleep."

(*e*) By doing all this He achieved our *reconciliation* to God, or the establishment of a basis on which, while by grace we work out our salvation, we are *justified* by faith, that is, we are accepted for what by faith we yield ourselves to become.[1]

§ 11. The death of Christ is the historic basis of a new covenant between God and man, sealed in blood. This covenant is embodied in a dispensation of grace, the completion of which required our Lord's resur-

[1] References are postponed to the next chapter.

rection and ascension, His heavenly priesthood, and the establishment and equipment, by His Holy Spirit, of the mystical Body, which is the visible Catholic Church. In this Church men are united with the glorified Saviour; and through its divinely instituted sacraments the quickening, cleansing and sanctifying grace, with which the Saviour's Manhood is endowed, is imparted to His members. It is thus imparted for their salvation from sin, and for their attainment "unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." By reason of the Church's organic relation to Christ, and its divine creation, its ministry is functionally organized from above. And this organization determines the corporate relations of its members to its Head in the heavens, "from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love." [1]

Such is the living machinery of salvation, and of the kingdom of God, a Church which our Lord's death purchased, and which His resurrection enabled Him to make a thing of life in Himself. To its establishment and saving function the death of Christ looks forward, and its place in the new covenant is part of the context which enables us rightly to understand the doctrine of the atonement. In particular, a realization of the mystical identification of sinners

[1] Eph. iv. 13, 15–16. Cf. Col. ii. 19.

with Christ, for the accomplishment of which the Church was from eternity designed, will save us from viewing onesidedly the vicarious aspect of our Lord's death, and from adopting certain really immoral substitutionist ideas.[1]

§ 12. Our knowledge that salvation is not an automatic result of Christ's death, although conditioned by it, but is accomplished in a dispensation wherein the saving grace of Christ is made effective by our moral response, enables us to do justice to the moral aspects of the passion without neglecting its objective side. The appealing challenge of love which the Cross embodies, the influence which it exerts in drawing men to repentance, and the unique example which it completes, have adequate place for recognition in a doctrine which makes Christ's death the initial condition only of salvation.[2] Speaking in the rough, the New Testament treats the Cross as the birthpang of saving grace. And in its doctrine the necessity that salvation from sin should include men's own moral recovery is adequately reckoned with and successfully met.

But this aspect of the New Testament doctrine has been hidden from view by the sixteenth-century protestant theory of justification by faith only. Into its more subtle details we cannot enter, but its most dangerous element is the idea that our justification is a purely forensic transaction, in which our

[1] *Creation and Man*, pp. 337–338; R. C. Moberly, ch. x; P. B. Bull, pp. 82–91; R. W. Dale, Lec. x.

[2] On the moral aspects, see ch. iv. §§ 9–12, below.

sins are imputed to Christ, and the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, and made to serve as a kind of cover of sin, and as a substitute for even the beginning of true righteousness in us. This theory represents a reaction from mechanical conceptions of the merit and effects of good works, but it is both immoral in its logic and contrary to the teaching of St. Paul, upon which it is ostensibly based.[1]

St. Paul does not teach that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, but that our faith in Him is imputed to us for righteousness.[2] Thus it is something in us, our own faith in Christ, that is the basis of the imputation, which is a judgment that our faith is righteousness. The sense in which it is truly so estimated appears in the context, in which St. Paul treats our faith as the initial work of sanctifying grace in us, and as the inception of our growth in the full righteousness of Christ. Accordingly, he teaches that we are justified, that is, accounted righteous, by faith, because faith is the childhood stage of our growth in righteousness, and God is pleased to estimate the child of grace at the value of the fullgrown man which he is in the way of becoming. There is no unreality here, nor is there any relaxation of moral requirement. If the child of grace fails to grow, the condition postulated in justification is unfulfilled, justifying grace ceases to operate, and justification comes to an end.

St. Paul denies our ability to attain to righteous-

[1] Cf. ch. ii. § 1, above.

[2] Rom. iv. 5.

ness by obedience to the law, on the ground that no one can perfectly fulfil its requirements, the law revealing our unrighteousness rather than making us righteous. But he does not infer from this that salvation can be attained without our becoming righteous. Rather he teaches that, in spite of our present inability to fulfil the eternal laws of God, we are given opportunity through faith in Christ to lay hold of and grow in His grace, and ultimately to become perfect after the pattern of His righteousness. So far from considering that Christ saves us independently of any real righteousness to be developed in us, he describes the ultimate effect of Christ's obedience as making many righteous.[1]

The sum of the matter is that we may not disregard the modern protest in behalf of the moral aspects of salvation. We are indeed bound to reject current Pelagianism, with its optimistic belief in the power of men to save themselves from sin without supernatural aid. We also have to maintain the objective and Godward aspects of the biblical and catholic doctrine of the atonement. But our attention to these necessities ought not to hinder us from perceiving that soteriological doctrine is fatally perverted when the need of moral response by men is overlooked, and the requirement that they should work out their own salvation is disregarded.

[1] Rom. v. 19. On justification, see *Creation and Man*, pp. 343–347, where other refs. are given on p. 343; also as *ad rem* here, G. B. Stevens, Pt. III. ch. xi.

CHAPTER IV

THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S DEATH

I. *Introductory Truths*

§ 1. The doctrine of our Lord's death, considered as an article of saving faith, has the simplicity of terms which it must have in order to be rightly apprehended and believed in by unlearned and untrained minds. *It is that Christ died to redeem mankind; and that because of this fact, through a contrite and living faith in His death and resurrection, and through union with Him, we are enabled to work out our own salvation.* This is what we need to believe; and its meaning is radically perverted, if we think that any other basis of salvation than that of His death and victory is afforded to men.

Many problems are suggested by this doctrine, and our theology of it becomes complex in proportion to the progress of our thinking.[1] But three steadying thoughts are to be remembered: (*a*) Although we cannot expect to profit by any doctrine unless we seriously exercise upon it what mental capacity we have, it is not our success as theologians, but our docile acceptance and practical application

[1] For bibliography on the theology of Christ's death, see p. 1, n. 1, above.

of truth that enables us to be saved by it; (*b*) The importance of a theological development of this and other Christian doctrines is partly individual, as representing the earnest thought concerning saving truth which trained minds ought to exercise, and partly general, as serving to give to what has been revealed a rational and credible place in human knowledge and belief at large; (*c*) It is not to be required of theology that it shall completely solve the problems suggested by revealed doctrine, because their full solution depends upon greater knowledge and higher mental powers than men either possess or can acquire. Theology makes progress in part by correcting its own crudities; and the only legitimate tests of its propositions are that they clearly presuppose the truth of revealed doctrine, and that they minister to such reasonable exposition of it as the existing stage of intellectual and theological development in the Church makes possible.

In no doctrine is the symbolical nature of its terms more necessary to remember than in that of the atonement. This has been touched upon already, but needs emphasis at this point. The fact that New Testament terms have divinely inspired authority does not remove their human limitations. In particular, they are necessarily borrowed from human analogies, which at best are inadequate when applied to the dealings of the Infinite with His creatures. None the less their authority is final for us, and we ought to accept them as "sound words" — that is,

as affording divinely inspired beginnings of such true exposition of the doctrines of redemption and salvation as we may hope to make in this world.[1]

We also need at this point to remind ourselves summarily of the doctrinal context which determines the significance of Christ's death. Since man is made for divine fellowship, and since the mutual congeniality and love required for its enjoyment depend upon our development in the righteousness of God, therefore an entire removal of sinfulness, and a mode of reconciliation to God which shall afford real reparation for sin, are indispensable. Persuasion also is necessary, if men are to turn from sin, including their conviction of need and their spiritual preparation for apprehending and accepting salvation. And this necessity has been met by the long preparation of Israel, by the morally appealing aspects of redemption, and by the conditions under which saving grace is afforded. These conditions are graciously adapted to the sacramental and social, as well as the moral, elements of human nature.

Inasmuch as redemption could only be achieved by a Person who united in Himself the power and status of God with human nature, experience and vicarship, the eternal Son of God took what is ours into personal union with what was His, and completed His human equipment as our Redeemer by a life of painful and

[1] R. W. Dale, pp. 355–359, says that the terms in question are not the *basis* of a true theory, but *tests* of it. The basis is the fact of Christ's death.

exemplary obedience to the Father's will. Thus equipped, He redeemed mankind by His death and resurrection, and was thereby consecrated for a heavenly priesthood, in which He has become the Author of salvation. This salvation is accomplished through His mystical body, to which His Holy Spirit has imparted life, and in which He operates so as to enable men to work out their salvation.

§ 2. Whether the death of Christ was necessary[1] or not should be considered in several relations. On man's side, it is to be maintained that he could not accomplish what Christ's death achieved for him;[2] and if this had not been achieved in some manner, he could not have been saved either from sin or from its fatal consequences. This is so because Christ's death rectifies relations between God and man which lie beyond human power to rectify, but which have to be rectified before any thing that man can do by way of repentance and fulfilment of righteousness can avail for the attainment of life with God.

We cannot, however, maintain that God could not have provided any other manner of redemption than that of Christ's death. But we can imagine no method which could so fully satisfy the conditions involved in reparation for sin and at the same time

[1] On the necessity and convenience of Christ's death, see St. Thomas, III. xlvi. 1–4, 9–11; A. J. Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, ch. vi. 3, 11; T. J. Crawford, pp. 421–440; R. W. Dale, Lec. ix.; Jas. Denney, *Atonement and the Modern Mind*, ch. iii.

[2] Cf. Psa. xlix. 7–15; Isa. lix. 16; lxiii. 5.

so powerfully influence men to accept it and work out their salvation on the basis of it. The appealing power of the Cross constitutes the basis of the so called moral theories of the atonement — theories which err in their denials rather than in their affirmations.

It is most earnestly to be maintained in this connection that something far deeper than a pure fiat of God lies behind the death of Christ.[1] We may infer from its fitness for human needs that it was determined by divine wisdom, and some objective drama of reparation to God for sin was plainly required. The thought that God could have pardoned sin without exacting reparation cannot be reconciled with an adequate conception of the requirements of divine love and righteousness, as they have been imperfectly set forth in the second chapter.

It may be maintained as a purely abstract proposition that God could have allowed mankind to perish, and that He did not have to provide the means of redemption and salvation. But all that this can rightly mean is that He was driven by no external necessity. Redemption was voluntary, both on the part of the Father who sent His Son into the world, and on the part of the Redeemer Himself. The moving cause of divine mercy is His love, a love which, by reason of its eternal nature, necessarily extends to all who in any age can be enabled to respond to its demands. The possibility that sinners might be delivered from sin, and thus enabled to

[1] Cf. pp. 29, 55–56, above.

enjoy His love, would seem to imply an impossibility that He would refuse to provide the means of deliverance. This kind of necessity is internal and moral. It is not contrary to divine voluntariness of action, but is a branch of the truth that the will of God is the expression of His nature and attributes, and cannot fail to express them. This argument is fortified by the thought that if the whole human race had been suffered to perish, the purpose of its creation would have been defeated. Such a result is incredible, whether we view it in relation to divine foreknowledge, or to the established possibility of saving mankind.

Once determined upon by God, and it was willed from eternity, the death of Christ had to be. Although God can will contingent events, He cannot reverse His will. Accordingly, all previous human history was providentially controlled with reference to Calvary; and Old Testament prophecy registered an inviolable pledge from God to men, which the Redeemer had to fulfil.[1]

§ 3. In order rightly to understand the vicarious aspect of our Lord's death, it is necessary to reckon with His mediatorial office at large,[2] of which His work as Redeemer and Saviour is a branch. The antecedent basis of His being the one Mediator between God and man is twofold: (*a*) His eternal relation to

[1] Cf. St. Matt. xxvi. 53–54, 56; St. Luke xxii. 22; xxiv. 44, 46.

[2] On which, see *The Incarnation*, chh. ix (other refs. on pp. 268–269); iv. § 10; vi. § 9.

the Father, as Son, Image and Word; (*b*) the relation of creatures to Him, as the Agent through whom they were made and in whom they consist.[1] To Him properly belonged the office, therefore, of intervening when the relations of mankind had been disturbed by sin.

The first step was to identify Himself with those whom He sought to save. And since they were "sharers of flesh and blood, He also Himself in like manner partook of the same," [2] making His own eternal Self, however, to be the Self of "the form of a servant" which He assumed.[3] Thus He made all men to be His brethren, and was perfected as their Example and Redeemer by temptation and suffering.[4]

Moreover, because He took no human ego, the separative limitations of human persons which interfere with their effective mutual coinherence do not hinder His union with His brethren. His divine Person, while it does not nullify the reality of His human nature and experience, does transcend the barriers between human selves.[5] And this advantage enables Him not only to identify us with Himself in a relation which is even closer than that of brotherhood, but also, through this union with Him, to unite us with each other in more intimate relations and interactions than our unassisted nature enables us to enjoy.

[1] See R. W. Dale, Lec. x; J. S. Lidgett, ch. vii.
[2] Heb. ii. 14. [3] Phil. ii. 7. [4] Heb. ii. 10–18.
[5] *The Incarnation*, chh. v. § 2; vi. §§ 1, 11–12.

The manner in which He has consummated this identification is the establishment of His Church, and His making it, by the operation of His Holy Spirit, to be His Body. By Baptism we are incorporated into His Body; and this event not only regenerates us by making us sharers in His resurrection life, but also achieves a union between us and Him by reason of which whatever He has done for us is virtually done by us through our true Head and representative. Thus He is our Vicar, and His death is effectively vicarious in meaning and value.[1]

It is on such grounds as these that St. Paul declares that it has been the will of God in the fulness of the times "to sum up all things in Christ" [2] — all things, because the relations between God and man have the whole creation within their reference. And on the same grounds, he describes Christ as the "Second Adam," a new Head of our race,[3] in whom we have redemption through His blood,[4] and who therefore has become "in us the hope of glory." [5] The penal substitution theory could never have been developed in its post-reformation form, if St. Paul's doctrine of the mystical Body had been reckoned with; and the modern recoil against this theory has gone astray because of similar obliviousness to the mystical identification between Christ and the sub-

[1] Our union with Christ in His Church is to be considered in the next volume.

[2] Eph. i. 10.

[3] Rom. v. 14–15; 1 Cor. xv. 20–23; Eph. i. 3–5, 10, 22–23; iv. 15–16; Col. i. 18.

[4] Col. i. 14.

[5] Col. i. 27.

jects of salvation.[1] A caricature of vicariousness, which has externalized Christ's sacrifice for sin, has been followed by an utter denial of the mystery thus misconceived.

§ 4. The words and phrases in the New Testament which have been used in support of substitutionist conceptions ought to be interpreted with regard not only to their immediate context, but also to the facts with which they have to do; and these facts are plainly inconsistent with penal substitution.[2] In the first place, our Lord's death was not penal, but was a voluntary and meritorious sacrifice of Himself for the sins of others. Secondly, the endless punishment of sin from which we escape by reason of His passion He did not endure either in duration or in kind, and the attempt to show that He bore the guilty pangs of the damned is hopeless. Finally, the sufferings which He did endure are sufferings in which we have to share, even to the point of physical death. His sufferings, in brief, do not take the place of ours, but consecrate them, give them purificatory value, and thus make them, in this respect like His own, transitory.

Nor do the facts justify our regarding the Redeemer as a moral substitute. In the first place, the

[1] W. A. Wright, *Problem of Atonement*, pp. 167–169, 209–214, repudiates the doctrine of mystical identification, substituting for it (pp. 230–233) the contagion of influence. Cf. G. B. Stevens, pp. 361–376.

[2] Ground has been broken on this subject in ch. i. § 8 and ch. ii. § 2, above. See L. Ragg, pp. 13–14, 100–121; L. Pullan, pp. 93–94 (but cf. p. 187); W. Milligan, *Ascension*, pp. 341–343.

sins from which He came to redeem us were not transferred to Him, for there was no sin in Him, except in the wholly false opinion of His persecutors. In brief, He did not become a sinner in our stead. In the second place, He was not righteous in our stead, for the righteousness which He practiced constitutes Him our example, the imitation of which is the *sine qua non* of our salvation.

What element of substitution is left? Surely only relative aspects, which should be called by a less absolute and misleading name. These aspects are partly redemptive and partly temporal. His sufferings stand alone in their redemptive value; and while they do not exempt us, His redeemed, from the obligation of taking up His Cross and suffering with Him, they do achieve a result which we could by no manner of means accomplish. Being unable to redeem ourselves, He redeemed us in our stead, and the biblical terms which seem to connote substitution are related not to His suffering in our stead, but to the unique and redemptive value of His passion. He *shared* in our sufferings,[1] but His sharing makes a difference which is incalculable.

Then there is the temporal aspect. At the time of doing it, what Christ did for us He did alone.[2] Our identification with Him and our full assimilation to

[1] Heb. ii. 10–11, 17–18; iv. 15; St. Matt. viii. 17; 2 Cor. i. 5–7; Col. i. 24; 2 Tim. ii. 10–12.

[2] Isa. lix. 16; Rom. v. 8–10. Cf. A. M. Fairbairn, *Philos. of the Christ. Religion*, p. 411.

Him are subsequent events, pending which He stands between us and God, as representing what we have not yet become, although as the surety of our becoming like Him by His grace. Thus for the time being, and provisionally, God accepts Him in our stead, thereby giving us a footing which we have to make good by attaining to "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." [1] In brief, because of what Christ is, our faith — a mere inception of righteousness — is provisionally imputed to us for the full-grown righteousness which we have yet to attain.[2]

A detailed examination of relevant passages in the New Testament will show that such words as *ἀντί* [3] and *ἀντίλυτρον* [4] cannot be translated in terms of literal substitution without in each case converting a rhetorical figure of speech into a more formal conception than the context really warrants.[5] Vicarious is a safer term than substitutional, since it agrees

[1] Eph. iv. 13.

[2] Cf. ch. iii. § 12, above. On Christ being our Surety and not our Substitute, see J. P. Norris, p. 222.

[3] St. Matt. xx. 28; St. Mark x. 45.

[4] 1 Tim. ii. 6. The ransom, described indifferently as His life and Himself, is not offered to God as a substitute for us, but as a thing with which we are to be united and offered likewise. Cf. St. John xvii. 9–12.

[5] The arguments for substitutional interpretation of *ἀντί*, and also of *ὑπέρ*, are given by T. J. Crawford, pp. 20–26. *Per contra*, see G. B. Stevens, pp. 45–47. An attempt to save the term "substitution" without adopting its immoral implications is made by J. G. Simpson, *What is the Gospel*, ch. vii. R. W. Dale, pp. 475–478, concedes that the numerous *ὑπέρ* passages do not in themselves necessarily signify substitution.

more closely with the thought of New Testament writers, and is free from the morally objectionable connotations which have gathered around substitutional terminology. In any case it is of vital importance to remember that what Christ did for us can never take the place of what by His grace we have to do in imitation of Him and in working out our own salvation. Salvation is a moral drama, which cannot be preached in terms of a non-moral transaction without disastrous results.

II. *Objective Aspects*

§ 5. By objective aspects of Christ's death we mean those aspects which describe it as itself bringing about once for all results which constitute it a sufficient historical basis of the dispensation of saving grace. They may be conveniently considered under four heads: (*a*) concrete descriptions of the passion — redemption and sacrifice for sin: (*b*) in relation to the remedy of sin — remission and cleansing; (*c*) in relation to the remedy of corruption — life; (*d*) in relation to God — propitiation and reconciliation.

In Scripture redemption, גאל, λύτρωσις, ἀπολύτρωσις, describes deliverance, sometimes by power,[1] and sometimes by purchase or exchange.[2] In the latter case, the price is called a ransom, λύτρον, ἀντίλυτρον.

[1] Exod. vi. 6; 2 Sam. vii. 23; Isa. l. 2; St. Luke xxi. 28.

[2] Exod. xiii. 13; Psa. xlix. 8; Eph. i. 14; 1 St. Pet. i. 18. On Redemption, see Hastings, *Dic. of Bib.* and *Dic. of Christ*, and *Cath. Encyc.*, *q. vv.*; J. P. Norris, pp. 81–84; S. J. Lidgett, pp. 299–300.

The verbs chiefly used to describe the act of redeeming are λυτρόω,[1] to deliver by payment of ransom; ἀγοράζω,[2] to purchase; and περιποιέω, (middle) to purchase.[3] A leading application of these words is to deliverance from servitude; and this is the basis, apparently, of their use in relation to the death of Christ, in which He gave His life-blood in order that human servitude to sin and its author, the devil, might be broken [4] — the process of our individual salvation from sin remaining to be accomplished, on the basis of this redemption, by a subsequently established dispensation of grace.

Such a description is obviously borrowed from purely human analogies; and its divine sanction does not remove the intrinsic limitations of such analogies when applied to relations in which God is concerned and in which the eternal moral order is involved. But a comparison of the New Testament passages in which redemptive terms are employed in describing Christ's death and its results, shows that that death is regarded by the sacred writers as the means of delivering mankind from the shackles which prevent us from escaping the power of sin and its author, and from becoming reconciled to God. This redemption is a work of divine power, but was achieved at the cost of the life-blood of Christ, this life-blood being described as price and ransom.

[1] Tit. ii. 13–14. [2] 1 Cor. vi. 20. [3] Acts xx. 28.
[4] St. Luke x. 17–20; St. John xii. 31–32 (cf. xiv. 30); Col. ii. 15; Heb. ii. 14–15; 1 St. John iii. 8.

Beyond this broad interpretation we cannot go, without risk of pressing the details of New Testament symbolism beyond warrant. The devil, no doubt, was the instigator of those who inflicted death upon Christ. The serpent bruised His heel.[1] But to interpret this as payment by Christ of a ransom to the devil is quite unwarranted.[2] The only payment made is described in terms of sacrifice, offered to God.

The terminology of redemption describes our Lord's death in relation to the evil from which it delivers us. In relation to God, on the other hand, it is described as the one effective sacrifice for sin[3] — a description which connects it with an obligation which sin did not originate. Sacrifice has long been defined by most writers exclusively in terms of sacrifice for sin,[4] and much serious error has resulted. In its elementary nature sacrifice signifies the formal offering of some external gift to God as the appropriate and formal expression of our internal self-oblation and will-surrender to Him.[5]

[1] Gen. iii. 15.

[2] The so called patristic theory, on which, see ch. i. § 6, above.

[3] Heb. ix. 22–28; x. 11–14. Cf. Isa. liii. 10; 1 Cor. v. 7; Eph. v. 2; 1 St. Pet. i. 19. On the sacrificial interpretation of Christ's death, see *Cath. Encyc.*, Hastings, *Dic. of Bib.*, and *Dic. of Christ*, *s. vv.* "Sacrifice"; L. Ragg, *passim;* J. P. Norris, pp. 174–182, 199–204, 235–249; Alfred Cave, Bk. II. ch. ii; S. J. Lidgett, pp. 106–120; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, pp. 91–94.

[4] So St. Thomas defines it, III. xlviii. 3. See B. J. Kidd, *Later Mediæval Doctr. of the Euch. Sacrifice*, pp. 49 *et seq.*

[5] Cf. *Lux Mundi*, pp. 279–282; H. N. Oxenham, Excursus VIII; W. Milligan, *Ascension*, pp. 116–119.

To make such self-oblation to God is an elementary function of religion, quite apart from sin; and the obligation to make it is grounded in our nature and in fundamental relations existing between us and our Maker.[1] This can be seen when we analyze the sacrifices of the Old Covenant. Their propitiatory aspects do not at all exhaust their meaning, for these rites were designed not only to procure acceptable approval to God for sinners, but also to express a formal self-oblation, and a grateful communion with God,[2] which are plainly obligatory to creatures as such. And the obligation is not only antecedent to the need of propitiation, but is of a nature which makes it permanent.

The achievement once for all of a full and perfect sacrifice for sin on the Cross does not, therefore, remove the necessity of the formal self-oblation which sacrifice embodies; nor does it obviate the necessity of representing and pleading Christ's sacrificial death as the basis of the acceptance of our self-oblations.[3]

The death of Christ is our sacrifice for sin because it satisfies the mysterious requirement that sinners must sanctify their approach to God not only by repentance, but also by death. Without shedding of blood is no remission. The wages of sin is death.[4]

[1] *Creation and Man*, pp. 219–220.

[2] The burnt offerings and peace offerings respectively. Cf. pp. 6–8, above.

[3] 1 Cor. xi. 26.

[4] Heb. ix. 22; Rom. vi. 23.

Man is not able by his own power to fulfil this requirement without perishing; and because Christ's death and victory successfully did so, and that vicariously, it is described as a sufficient sacrifice for sin, and as needing no repetition.[1]

Although this sacrifice was historically achieved at a certain temporal date, its Consummator was the Eternal; and thus it constitutes the basis of acceptance of our self-oblations at all times, and is the unitive principle of all sacrifice.[2] To it the ineffective rites of the Old Law pointed; and, as representing pleading and applying it, the Christian Eucharist is an effectual and acceptable sacrifice to God.[3] But since the sacrifice of the Cross is the validating principle in every Eucharist, there is in reality but one sacrifice, made once for all on Calvary, and living on in the Eucharistic oblations of every succeeding generation of men. The connecting link between the Cross and Eucharistic representations of it is the heavenly priesthood of Christ, a mystery which is to be considered in our last chapter.[4]

§ 6. The fact that the death of Christ is a sacrifice for sin affords evidence that it has to do with remis-

[1] Heb. ix. 11–12, 25–28; x. 10–14, 18.

[2] Heb. x. 19–22; xiii. 10–15.

[3] When Jewish sacrifices ceased to be offered, Christians began to emphasize the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist, as being the offering of Old Testament prophecy. Mal. i. 11. Cf. Jerem. xxxiii. 18.

[4] Cf. also ch. iii. § 8, above.

sion of sin, a subject to which we now come. The relevant teaching of the New Testament includes the following particulars: (*a*) that Christ suffered for sinners and for their sins;[1] (*b*) that He bore our sins on the tree, He who knew no sin being made sin for us;[2] (*c*) that Christ became a curse for us, that is, in human eyes, by hanging on the tree;[3] (*d*) that He shed His blood for the remission or forgiveness of sins;[4] (*e*) that His blood, thus shed, washes us and cleanses us from sin;[5] (*f*) that the meritorious value of His death for removing sin is due to His obedience to the will of the Father.[6]

The problem as to how the physical death of Christ and His poured-out blood can bring about the moral result thus ascribed to it is nowhere directly considered in Scripture. But certain data are given which indicate the direction in which the answer lies. There is the broad fact that because of sin human life is forfeited, and the life is in the blood, so that the manner of reparation for sin is the shedding of man's life-blood,[7] an event which causes men

[1] Rom. iv. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 3; Gal. i. 4; 1 St. Pet. iii. 18. Cf. Isa. liii. 5, 8.

[2] 2 Cor. v. 21; Heb. ix. 28; 1 St. Pet. iii. 24. Cf. Isa. liii. 6, 11–12.

[3] Gal. iii. 13. Cf. Isa. liii. 6.

[4] St. Matt. xxvi. 28; St. Luke xxiv. 46–47; St. John i. 29; Eph. i. 7; Heb. x. 16–18.

[5] Tit. iii. 5; 1 St. John i. 7; Revel. i. 5; vii. 14. Cf. Zech. xii. 1. Forgiveness precedes cleansing, but presupposes that it will be accomplished.

[6] Heb. x. 5–9.

[7] Levit. xvii. 11–14; Heb. x. 22.

to perish. Christ, however, shed His blood without being overcome of death; and, through our identification with Him in His body, we die in Him and rise again to a life in which no taint of sin remains.

The reason why sin causes our lives to be forfeited is not because God is pleased with the death of the wicked,[1] but, apparently, because, from the nature of things, no other effective reparation and remedy for sin can be afforded. The moral and physical parts of our nature are inseparable and mutually interact, so that moral corruption carries with it physical corruption. Human nature, in brief, is thrown into radical disorder by sin and cannot be cured, apparently, except by being reconstituted. And for this reconstitution there is required not only the infusion of the regenerative life of Christ's Manhood, but also the sloughing off of the old corruption through physical death.[2] It is perhaps correct to describe death as a surgical operation, in which the corrupted elements of our nature are dissected and cleansed, our union with Christ preventing a fatal issue. In any case the righteousness of God cannot be safeguarded, which is another way of saying that the wrath of the loving Father cannot be finally removed, unless something is done that will entirely remove the seeds of sin from our nature.

[1] Ezek. xviii. 23, 32; xxxiii. 11; 1 Tim. ii. 4; 2 St. Pet. iii. 9.

[2] Rom. vi. 5–7, 10–11. On remission of sins by Christ's death, see R. W. Dale, pp. 19–26 and Lecs. ix–x; T. J. Crawford, Pt. I. § iv; St. Thomas, III. xlix. 1.

§ 7. The paragraph just written breaks ground for the general subject of the relation of Christ's death to life[1] — what may be described in modern terms as its biological and evolutionary aspect. In so far as sin has interrupted man's development after the likeness of God,[2] the remedy for sin which Christ's death provides, has the effect of renewing his development. There is an involution, so to speak, of a regenerative and sanctifying germ, which the Incarnation made available, which the death of the Incarnate has perfected, and which His resurrection has immortalized and endowed with revivifying power. It is by the life of the Redeemer that we are saved.[3]

This aspect of the mystery brings the Incarnation to the fore, as the conditioning factor of all that follows; and certain of the ancients were led by their emphasis upon it to ascribe to the Incarnation,

[1] On which, see *Schaff-Herzog Encyc.*, *s. v.* "Atonement," § 2; Hastings, *Dic. of Bib.*, *s. v.* "Life and Death"; *Dic. of Christ*, *s. v.* "Life"; B. F. Westcott, *Epp. of St. John*, pp. 214–218; A. Moore, *Some Aspects of Sin*, pp. 71–77. The patristic classic on this subject is St. Athanasius, *De Incarn.*, §§ 4 *et seq.* For patristic thought at large in this direction, see J. Rivière, Vol. I. pp. 138–188.

[2] On the effect of sin in interrupting and retarding human development, see *Evolution and the Fall*, Lecs. v–vi; A. Moore, *Essays Scientific and Phil.* pp. 61–66; J. Orr, *God's Image in Man*, pp. 201–212. Related matter can be found in S. A. McDowall's *Evolution and the Need of Atonement;* P. N. Waggett's criticism of this, in *Ch. Qly. Review*, for Apr., 1914, art. VIII; and McDowall's rejoinder, in the July number, art. VI.

[3] Rom. v. 10.

without immediate qualification, the effects which in formal reference should be ascribed, as they are in the New Testament, to our Lord's death and victory over death. The fathers referred to did, in other connections, show their acceptance of the traditional and New Testament doctrine that Christ's death is the formal method of redemption;[1] and the theory of certain moderns, that the Incarnation *rather than* the passion is the cause of redemption, is not only erroneous, but caricatures the position of the fathers who are appealed to for its support.[2]

The truth which these fathers emphasized, sometimes in unguarded terms, is that the life which Christ came to bring, upon our reception of which depends the value of Christ's death for us, is His because He is God, and is brought into this world by God becoming incarnate. If, by a common figure of speech, we ascribe to the initial and enabling factor in a process the effects which the full process brings about, we may say that God became man with the result of making us partakers of the divine nature[3] — that is, of the immortal life which

[1] See, J. Rivière, as cited. St. Athanasius, *c. Apoll.*, II. 5, says, God "was pleased by the fulness of His Godhead to set up again for Himself, from the Virgin's womb, through a natural birth and an indissoluble union, the originally formed man, and (to make) a new handiwork, that He might perform the business of salvation of men by suffering and death and resurrection."

[2] On the part in salvation of our Lord's Incarnation and earthly life, see ch. iii. § 6, above.

[3] 2 St. Pet. i. 4.

is seated in God; — and it is in this sense that the ancients seem to have used the startling phrase, God became man that man might become God.[1]

Of New Testament writers it is St. John who most characteristically, although not exclusively, sets forth this aspect of redemption. According to him, (*a*) the purpose for which Christ came was to give us eternal life;[2] (*b*) this life is in Christ Himself, who is the life;[3] (*c*) we gain life from Him, and through union with Him;[4] that is, (*d*) if we believe in Him and keep His commandments.[5] Yet he plainly teaches that, in order to fulfil His life-giving mission, Christ died for us;[6] that our sins are cleansed by His blood;[7] and that He is the propitiation for our sins.[8]

The relation of Christ's death to life and to the renewal of human development, when thoughtfully considered, reminds us that the Incarnation ministers to a larger purpose than that of mere salvation from sin.[9] But we need most carefully to

[1] Cf. pp. 23–24, above.

[2] St. John iii. 16; vi. 40; x. 10; 1 St. John iv. 9. Cf. Rom. vi. 23; Eph. ii. 5–6; Tit. iii. 5–6.

[3] St. John i. 4; v. 26; vi. 27 *et seq.;* xiv. 6; 1 St. John v. 11.

[4] St. John vi. 27 *et seq.;* x. 28; xvii. 2; 1 St. John v. 12. Cf. Rom. v. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 20–22; Gal. ii. 20; Col. ii. 12–13; iii. 3; and the doctrine of the mystical Body of Christ, Eph. iv. 4–16, etc.

[5] St. John iii. 36; v. 24; vi. 40, 47; 1 St. John v. 1.

[6] St. John iii. 14.

[7] 1 St. John i. 7.

[8] 1 St. John ii. 1–2; iv. 10.

[9] Cf. *The Incarnation*, pp. 81–89.

remember that, apart from redemption, that is, from the mystery of the Cross, the race must have been lost and the purpose of the Incarnation could not have been fulfilled.

§ 8. Propitiation and reconciliation, ἱλασμός[1] and καταλλαγή,[2] express closely connected ideas which in themselves require no profound analysis to understand. To propitiate, ἱλάσκομαι,[3] is to remove wrath, and to reconcile [4] is to restore broken relations; and it is thus that the words are used in the New Testament.[5] The previously existing wrath of God towards sinners, on the one hand, and alienation of sinners from God, on the other hand, are in every instance implied, and are themselves asserted in several places.[6] No theory of Christ's death which evades this description of its occasion and purpose does justice to New Testament doctrine.

It has already been shown that the wrath of God is not to be regarded as characterized by the passionate and vindictive qualities of human anger, but that it does represent a real attitude of the

[1] 1 St. John ii. 2; iv. 10.

[2] Rom. v. 11; xi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 18–19.

[3] Heb. ii. 17. Cf. St. Luke xviii. 18, "God be merciful, ἱλασθητί, to me, a sinner."

[4] The verb καταλάσσω is used in Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18–20; and ἀποκαταλάσσω in Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 20–21.

[5] On propitiation and reconciliation, see Hastings, *Dic. of Bible* and *Dic. of Christ, q. vv.;* S. J. Lidgett, ch. v; R. W. Dale, pp. 161–168; J. P. Norris, pp. 66–81; T. J. Crawford, pp. 65–83.

[6] Rom. i. 18; ii. 5, 8; ix. 22, on the one hand, and Rom. v. 10; Eph. ii. 12; iv. 18; Col. i. 21; St. Jas. iv. 4, on the other hand.

moral Governor of the universe, and one with which sinners have to reckon. It is not a private matter, expressive of what we usually mean by personal resentment; but describes the attitude of one whose self-vindication and judicial treatment of sin are necessary for the maintenance of the moral order, and — a point very widely overlooked — for the triumph of love.[1] On the human side, the fact that sin is rebellion against God, and represents subjective alienation from Him, although sufficiently witnessed to in the New Testament, is in itself too obvious to be sincerely denied by intelligent men.

Repentance does not of itself heal this breach; nor is true repentance naturally possible for sinners, because of the blinding, hardening and weakening effect of sin upon our minds, hearts and wills. The New Testament teaches that the death of Christ procures for us the grace of repentance;[2] and that, as a representative sacrifice for sin, it affords the historic basis of the effect of repentance in securing pardon from God. Because it does afford such a basis, Christ's death is said to reconcile us to God, and to set forth the Redeemer to be a propitiation for us. In this teaching, we find an unmistakable warrant for the doctrine previously maintained in these pages,[3] that by His death the Son of God made a representative reparation for human sin — a reparation not less clearly taught because we

[1] Ch. ii. §§ 9–12, above. [2] Acts v. 31; xi. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 25.
[3] In ch. ii. §§ 11–12.

find no biblical evidence that Christ's death was penal to Him.

An incidental question ought to be dealt with at this point. Are we justified in saying that God is reconciled to us by Christ's death?[1] In a sense, Yes, although the phrase needs guarding from a common misinterpretation. If it means, as frequently understood, that God is made loving towards mankind by what Christ did, such a notion is abhorrent and unscriptural; for God's love for sinners was the moving cause of His sending the Redeemer into the world.[2] The only tolerable sense of the phrase in question is this, that the wrath of God — shown elsewhere in this volume to be a branch of His love — is satisfied by Christ's death, that is for all who properly identify themselves with Him. Reconciliation has to do with a mutual relation, one in which both parties to the breach are concerned. But the New Testament seems, none the less, to avoid the phrase; and frequent misinterpretation of it teaches us to be very cautious in its use.

In the New Testament the terms "reconciliation" and "propitiation," especially the latter, are not invariably confined in application to the immediate effects of Christ's death, and failure to notice this

[1] The second of our *Articles of Religion* says, "Who truly suffered . . . to reconcile His Father to us." Cf. Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, pp. 129–130.

[2] St. John iii. 16–17.

is connected with the "orthodox" protestant tendency to eliminate from consideration the part which men fulfil in working out their salvation. By the death of Christ God set Him forth to be a propitiation, that is, to be a continuing means of propitiation,[1] by which sinners in every generation can reconcile themselves to God. Christ is to-day our peace, and our mercy seat, so to speak, through which by His blood we gain access to, and acceptance with, God.[2] The blood of Christ is the blood of a new covenant,[3] the terms of which, when fulfilled by us, secure pardon, cleansing, reconciliation and peace.[4] In brief, it is Christ's death that removes for our race as a whole the initial barrier to the flow of saving grace. Yet personal salvation is a twofold work of divine grace and human coöperation, made possible by Christ's death, but not achieved without our moral effort.

III. *Moral Aspects*

§ 9. If we have not made clear in previous chapters our full sympathy with the modern insistence that redemption and salvation shall be morally inter-

[1] In Rom. iii. 25 Christ is said to have been set forth by God "to be a propitiation through faith in His blood." The word used is ἱλαστήριον, meaning a propitiatory instrument.

[2] In Heb. ix. 5, the same word ἱλαστήριον, is used to denote the mercy seat of the Tabernacle, obviously as being the place of propitiation in the ritual of the Day of Atonement.

[3] 1 Cor. xi. 25; St. Matt. xxvi. 28; St. Mark xiv. 24; St. Luke xxii. 20. Cf. Heb. ix. 16–26.

[4] Isa. liii. 5; St. Luke ii. 14; Acts x. 36; Rom. v. 1; Eph. ii. 13–14.

preted, we have failed in a leading purpose. Sin is a moral evil, the remedy for which, from the very nature of the case, is a moral salvation. Consequently everything that ministers to this remedy, however external and physical may be its immediate form and description, takes on the moral significance of the purpose to which it ministers, and with reference to which it has to be interpreted, if it is rightly to be understood.

But, as has been shown, the moral and the physical, sin and death, are inseparably interrelated, both in our nature and in our actions and their consequences. It follows that they are also thus interrelated in the reversal of sin and its consequences.[1] The physical concomitants and conditions of moral actions and changes, in so far as they are their concomitants and conditions, take on the moral qualities of the actions and changes which they condition. So it is with objective factors, factors which have immediate effects of their own, as distinguished from remoter effects which they are intended to make possible. If, and in so far as, they are designed to afford conditions of moral change, they have moral reference, and are to be described and interpreted morally.

According to the New Testament the death of Christ, physical though it was in itself, had a moral purpose, and was determined in form and circumstance by the design that its results should minister to that purpose.

[1] Ch. ii. § 7, above.

Its so called objective aspects — that is, its immediate effects — were intensely moral, because they conditioned, and were designed with reference to, the moral drama of human recovery from sin. If by distinguishing the objective and moral aspects of the atonement we signify their mutual opposition, or even their separability, we most grievously err.[1]

Comprehensively regarded, the moral aspects of our Lord's death are twofold: (*a*) the broad fact that its purpose was to achieve results which make possible the moral recovery of man from sin; (*b*) the congruity of His death, regarded in the light of His Person and character and of its historical context, with this moral purpose — that is, the moral fitness of the method by which God willed to redeem mankind.[2] In dealing with the objective aspects of Christ's death we have at the same time been setting forth its moral aspects in the first sense above defined; and that they are moral as well as objective cannot reasonably be denied.

But in modern use the phrase "moral aspects" has come to denote the aspects which are emphasized, somewhat exclusively, in the so-called "moral

[1] There is indeed some truth in the contention of G. B. Stevens, pp. 256–260 (cf. R. C. Moberly, pp. 140–141), that the distinction, when stressed too far, conceals "a good deal of word-jugglery." The danger is met by remembering that we are considering "aspects" — not separable elements.

[2] This is dealt with in scholastic theology under the heading, The Convenience of Christ's Death; *e.g.* see St. Thomas, III. xlvi. 3–4, 9–11.

theories"[1] — those which immediately lend themselves to moral description, and reveal the moral fitness of the method of redemption. It is these aspects to which we devote the rest of this chapter.

§ 10. Christ's death, and the drama in which it is the crisis, was a convenient method of redeeming mankind, because it revealed in unmistakable terms what we need to know in order to realize its significance and to profit by it. It was an effective revelation because given in objective terms of human experience. And these terms were calculated to bring to a focus and articulate all that mankind had previously, although gropingly and imperfectly, learned through experience of sin and its consequences. They were also in line with prophecy, and with the external ritual whereby God had taught His chosen people of old to express their relations to Him as sinners.[2]

But both the meaning and the effectiveness of this revelation depend upon the fact that He who died in flesh was personally divine. If He had been

[1] Among those who more or less completely put aside the "objective" aspects in favour of the "moral" or "subjective" aspects are G. B. Stevens (Pt. III) and the writers considered by him in Pt. II. ch. v — especially Schleiermacher, Albrecht Ritschl, Auguste Sabatier, Benjamin Jowett and Horace Bushnell. To these should be added W. A. Wright, *Problem of the Atonement*, who displays a remarkable combination of acute logic and incapacity to understand the objective aspects. Both he and G. B. Stevens decline to accept wholly the authority of St. Paul's doctrine — a significant fact.

[2] This has been shown in ch. i. §§ 2–3, above.

a mere man, His moral perfection and heroism could not have imparted to His death the redemptive significance and value which it has; and we cannot rightly understand the Cross, unless we reckon with our Lord's teaching concerning Himself, as vindicated by His resurrection from the grave. Even a prophet's death could not have signified, as the Cross does signify, a divine intervention, upon the results of which our hope of deliverance from sin depends. It is because we have learned that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself,[1] that we recognize in His death the redemption of mankind.[2]

Our Lord's obedience unto death, when interpreted in its background and context, reveals, in particular, (*a*) the true nature and malignity of sin, (*b*) the righteousness to which we have to turn, if we would escape from sin, and (*c*) the basis upon which alone salvation from sin is possible.

(*a*) It reveals the moral significance of sin, because it objectifies God's condemnation of it in terms which we can correctly, even though inadequately, understand from the outset, and which we are able progressively to comprehend and ratify, as we grow in the grace of repentance derived from Christ. It reveals also the malignity of sin, because in it is exemplified the attitude of sinners toward one whose

[1] 2 Cor. v. 19.

[2] Cf. ch. iii. § 5, above. Also R. W. Dale, pp. xlvii–lii, on the fact that moral theories depend for value on the objective aspects which they deny.

life was righteous, and whose call to repentance they scorned. Finally, it reveals the moral consequences of sin not only as converting the world into a place of suffering for the righteous, but as costing for its remedy the death of God's own beloved Son. The persuasiveness of this revelation is derived from the display of divine love and sympathy embodied in it, a subject to be taken up in the next section.

(*b*) The Gospel drama also reveals Jesus Christ as the pattern of our righteousness. The detached centurion was persuaded by the manner of Christ in His death that He was righteous,[1] for in it was exemplified perfect charity and patience. But this exhibition was the concluding chapter of a sinless life, in which ideal righteousness was completely actualized under the trying conditions of human experience in a sinful world. Yet, as has been shown in a previous volume, the significance of our Lord's example does not lie wholly in its flawless splendour; for had His perfection been that of a mere man, it would have appeared as simply an abnormal exception, which could neither bind our consciences nor encourage belief in the possibility of following Him.[2] But His life, human though it was, was that of God-incarnate. His righteousness is that of God, whom it is our duty to imitate,[3]

[1] St. Luke xxiii. 47.

[2] *The Incarnation*, pp. 124–128, 263–265. It would be what evolutionists call a "sport."

[3] He is not only righteous, but is "THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." Jerem. xxiii. 6.

and from whom we receive grace to grow after His likeness.

(*c*) The revelation of Christ's passion must be accepted, if at all, in its own context, rather than in the terms of modern speculation. It teaches us that on the Cross one who claimed to be the sole means of approach to the Father gave His life a ransom for many, and that His blood was shed for the remission of sins. If the Cross does not reveal this, which it does not unless He overcame death and rose from the grave, it is nothing more than a unique sample of martyrdom, differing only in degree from many other samples; and the world has not been redeemed.[1]

§ 11. The love revealed by the Cross constitutes its most attractive and appealing aspect, and affords material for large exposition and enthusiastic rhetoric. But the temptation involved must be resisted — not only because of limitations of space, but because the thesis of redeeming love is a truism among those for whom this volume is written, and the writer's expository and constructive purpose will be confused by dwelling at length upon it.[2]

[1] On the Cross as a revelation and example, see *The Incarnation*, pp. 257–261, 274–276; R. C. Moberly, ch. v; T. J. Crawford, pp. 161–165; G. B. Stevens, pp. 40–41. Emphasis upon the exemplary aspect characterized the Socinian theory.

[2] On the Cross as a challenge of love, see R. C. Moberly, pp. 146–153; R. W. Dale, pp. xlv–lv (who shows that the moral appeal of the Cross depends upon its objective aspects); T. J. Crawford, pp. 158–161. Onesided stress on the love of the Cross characterized

Our thesis is that the death of Christ is a revelation of the love of God for sinners which embodies a powerful appeal — a challenge, calculated to induce loving response from sinners and repentance for sin.[1] Repentance alone cannot, indeed, save men; nor is true repentance possible except by the grace which the death of Christ makes available. But it is the first step on man's side in salvation; and the fact that the method of redemption is calculated to persuade men to repent demonstrates its moral fitness.

The love which is displayed is that of God, and if we could not identify it as His, the Cross would not have the meaning and appealing power which we find therein. But how can it be divine unless the cost of Christ's death is divine? What makes that death the most appealing manifestation of love which mankind has experienced is the truth that in it God purchased the Church and redeemed us with His own blood.[2] Jesus Christ is divine, and while we were yet sinners He died for us. He was God's eternal Son, and God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son.[3] It was God who

---

Abelard's theory, and is found notably in H. Bushnell's *Vicarious Sacrifice.*

[1] St. John xii. 32. The lifting up refers immediately to the Cross, but also to His heavenly exaltation.

[2] Acts xx. 28; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14. The Person of the Redeemer in the last two passages is obviously He who is identified with God in the first passage.

[3] Rom. v. 8; St. John iii. 16.

in Christ bore our sins, and on whom fell the chastisement of our peace.[1] Accordingly we find in Christ's death a significance and effect which no human martyr's death can have.

This cost to God shows not only the greatness of His love for sinners, but also its exacting quality. It is not characteristic of God to waste His resources, and He would not have sent His Son to die, if a less costly way could have been adopted of reconciling sinners to Himself. Divine love and human sin are mutual incompatibles; and the barriers to that righteousness in us upon which the fruition of divine love depends had to be removed before the demands of love could be satisfied. The fact that Christ's death was the method of making this consummation possible seems to show that no less costly method was available.[2]

§ 12. Our Lord Himself predicted the unique influence which His death was to exercise when He said, "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me."[3] Men have too often resisted this drawing, but it has been felt, even among the most obstinate, by all to whom a true knowledge of the Gospel has come. The abiding power of the Church is explained by the influence of the Cross; and whenever its witness to the Redeemer's atoning death has given way to other interests and to other

[1] 1 St. Pet. ii. 24; Isa. liii. 5–6.
[2] Cf. ch. ii. § 12, above.
[3] St. John xii. 32.

truths, however precious, its power has been threatened and for the time being reduced.[1]

This influence cannot be described adequately in any terms except its own. Call it personal influence, call it moral contagion, or call it by any other terms which apply to other examples of influence, and its mystery is very far from being explained. The only possible explanation lies in the Cross being what the New Testament teaches it to be — the objective means by which God has redeemed mankind, a means made effective for personal salvation through the dispensation of grace in the mystical Body of Christ, in which men are cleansed by the blood of Christ, and are enabled to overcome the wicked one.[2]

"In the Cross of Christ I glory,
Towering o'er the wrecks of time.
All the light of sacred story
Gathers round its head sublime."

[1] When the Church seems most dead to her spiritual nature, the revival takes an evangelical form. The evangelical movement of the close of the eighteenth century was the necessary antecedent of the later catholic movement; and the catholic movement depends for continued vitality upon its evangelical element.

[2] 1 St. John i. 7; ii. 13–14; v. 18.

CHAPTER V

AMONG THE DEAD

I. *Our Lord's Death*

§ 1. Crying with a loud voice, we are told, Jesus gave up the ghost,[1] that is, He died. This has been denied in the desire to overthrow the evidence of His resurrection.[2] It is urged that crucifixion does not as a rule result fatally so soon, as is borne out by the fact that the thieves who were crucified with Him were still alive when the soldiers came to remove the bodies, and also by the surprise of Pilate when informed that He was already dead. We should remember, however, that our Lord had been exhausted by much suffering before He was crucified; and the double flow of blood and water — apparently a separation of the red and white corpuscles — which resulted from the piercing of His side by the soldiers, is said to prove not only the fact that He had already died, but that the immediate cause of His death was the breaking of His heart. Even if He were not already dead, the piercing of His side would have killed Him.

[1] St. Matt. xxvii. 50; St. Mark xv. 37. Cf. St. Luke xxiii. 46; St. John xix. 30.

[2] The theory is that He merely swooned; on which, see ch. vii. § 1, below, where refs. are given on the reality of His death.

He had to die, for the reparation which He came to offer for sin included death, and unless He had truly died He could not have overcome death in our behalf.[1] All that the resurrection means for us hinges on the reality of His death, the testimony to which is conclusive from every standpoint except that of an utter denial of the historical value and credibility of the Gospels. To a believer in the Scriptures the fact of His death gains confirmation — we are not here speaking of historical evidence and formal proof — by the remarkable agreement of the circumstances of His death and burial with Old Testament prophecies.[2]

§ 2. The Apostles' Creed ascribes to our Lord's Person both the burial of His body and the descent of His spirit into Hades, and this agrees with the New Testament. St. Paul says that He was buried, and St. Peter speaks of His being "quickened in the spirit; in which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison."[3] In brief, the several things

[1] See Bp. Pearson, *Apos. Creed*, art. iv. fol. 209–217; St. Thomas, III. l.

[2] *E.g.*, compare (1) Psa. xxii. 7–8 with St. Matt. xxvii. 39–43; (2) Psa. xxii. 16 with St. Luke xxiv. 39 and St. John xx. 27; (3) Psa. xxxiv. 10 with St. John xix. 33, 36; (4) Psa. lxix. 21 with St. Matt. xxvii. 34 and St. Mark xv. 23; (5) Isa. liii. 7 with St. Matt. xxvii. 12 and 1 St. Pet. ii. 23; (6) Isa. liii. 8 with St. Mark xv. 16, 20; (7) Isa liii. 12 with St. Luke xxiii. 32–33; (8) Isa. l. 6 with St. Matt. xxvi. 67–68; (9) Dan. ix. 26 with St. Matt. xx. 28; (10) Zech. xii. 10 with St. John xix. 34, 37; (11) Isa. liii. 9 with St. Matt. xxvii. 57–60, etc.

[3] 1 Cor. xv. 4; 1 St. Pet. iii. 18–20.

which happened to His flesh and spirit after His death happened to Him. The body in the grave was still His own, and the spirit in Hades was also His. One of the indications that death did not separate His body from Himself is the fact that His flesh saw no corruption,[1] a fact most reasonably explained by its continued possession by the Prince of life.[2]

In theological terms these facts are gathered up in the proposition that the hypostatic union of Godhead and Manhood in the one Person of the eternal Son of God[3] — the union which was brought about by the Incarnation — was not broken by His death. There was the rupture of relations between His body and His human spirit which death causes or represents, but this rupture did not sunder the relations of either the fleshly or the spiritual part of His Manhood to Himself. They continued to share with His Godhead in the unity of one divine and personal Subject.[4]

If our Lord was to accomplish what He came to do, this was clearly necessary; for it was an indispensable part of His mission that He should personally experience the conditions of death, and this He could not have done if the burial had not

[1] Acts ii. 27. Cf. Psa. xvi. 9–10.

[2] Acts iii. 15. [3] Cf. *The Incarnation*, pp. 102–104.

[4] St. Thomas, III. l. 2–3; Rich. Hooker, *Eccles. Polity*, V. lii. 4; A. P. Forbes, *Nicene Creed*, pp. 223–224; W. Bright, *Serms. of St. Leo*, n. 96.

been His burial, and if the experiences of His spirit in Hades had not been His own. Moreover, the significance for us of His victory over death would have been fatally reduced if there had been a breach of continuity, a change of identity, in any part of the nature in which He suffered and in which He was raised and glorified.

§ 3. Our Lord's body did not see corruption.[1] This does not mean that it was either by nature incorruptible [2] or exempt in the grave from the initial effects of death, but that its corruption was prevented by its reanimation on the third day. The fact remains that in the usual sense of terms His flesh was dead while in the tomb. It was no longer animated by its spirit, and no longer in that kind of "correspondence with environment" by which the life of the body declares itself.[3] As a true corpse it was wrapped in the customary clothes employed by the Jews, was at least partially embalmed, and was laid to rest in a tomb before which a heavy stone was rolled for its security.[4]

[1] Acts ii. 27. Cf. Psa. xvi. 9–10.

[2] A theory maintained by the monophysite *Aphthartodocetæ*. See *q. v.* in Blunt, *Dic. of Sects and Heresies* and the *Dic. of Christ. Biog.*

[3] See St. Thomas, III. l. 5; li. 3; St. John Damasc. *Orth. Fid.*, III. xxviii. There was a traditional idea among the Jews that the human spirit hovered over the corpse until the third day, and that dissolution then began. Cf. W. J. S. Simpson, *Resurrection and Modern Thought*, pp. 57–58.

[4] St. Matt. xxvii. 57–66; St. Mark xv. 42–47; St. Luke xxiii. 50–56; St. John xix. 38–42.

Whatever else may be said of His spirit, it underwent the conditions to which human spirits are subject after death, descending to Hades, the place of departed spirits,[1] and remaining there from Friday evening until the dawn of the following Sunday. But His Godhead did not die, nor did His death in the Manhood in any way alter or reduce His divine fulness and power.[2] He was still the Lord of glory, in spite of His submission in the Manhood to the conditions of mortality to which our nature is subject. The descent into Hades is to be asserted of Christ, therefore, in relation to His human spirit, and not in relation to His Godhead, which is omnipresent and not subject to the conditions and changes of local presence.[3]

The doctrine here maintained was used by the ancient fathers as evidence that Apollinaris was wrong in saying that the Word took the place of a rational soul in Christ;[4] and this shows conclusively that the descent of our Lord's human spirit into Hades was then an accepted catholic doctrine.[5]

[1] Eph. iv. 9; 1 St. Pet. iii. 19; Acts ii. 27, 31.

[2] That no real kenôsis occurred to our Lord at any time during His self-effacement in the Manhood has been shown in *The Incarnation*, ch. vii, and at greater length in *The Kenotic Theory*.

[3] *See Being and Attrib. of God*, pp. 286–289.

[4] See Bp. Pearson, fol. 237, who refers to St. Athanasius, *c. Apoll.* i. 13, etc.

[5] On this doctrine, see Hastings, *Dic. of Christ*, *s. v.* "Hell, Descent into"; St. Thomas, III. lii; D. Stone, pp. 300–304; A. P. Forbes, *Nicene Creed*, pp. 224–226; Bp. Pearson, on art. V.; F. Huidekoper, *Concerning Christ's Mission to the Underworld*, pp. 48–54, 66–78; 164–171; E. H. Plumptre, *Spirits in Prison*, *passim*.

II. *In Hades*

§ 4. The Scriptures do not definitely answer the question as to whether our Lord entered the place of the damned, and the opinion that He did not has widely prevailed among Christian writers. But the view that He did enter that place, for the purpose of leading captivity captive, and of triumphing over the powers of darkness,[1] is a permissible one. Much controversy has occurred in relation to the question, but to review its details is both useless and liable to disturb the perspectives in which we should contemplate revealed certainties. For this reason, and because of the lack of determinative data, no opinion as to whether our Lord descended into the lowest Hell is here ventured.[2]

But the opinion of the reformers that the Redeemer underwent the sufferings of the damned in Hell[3] is certainly to be rejected. It is not only unsupported by scriptural evidence, but is inconsistent with our Lord's entire freedom from any sense of guilt, and therefore from the despairing remorse which characterizes the misery of the lost. Obviously He could not have suffered physical torments, because His body was in the condition of insensibility which belongs to the state of death.

[1] Cf. Eph. iv. 8–9 (with Psa. lxviii. 18); i. 20–22; Col. i. 13, 15; Heb. ii. 14–15; 1 St. Pet. iii. 22.

[2] Bp. Pearson says No, *op. cit.*, art. v. Cf. Bp. Forbes, *op. cit.*, p. 225.

[3] So Calvin, *Institutes*, Bk. II. ch. xvi. §§ 3–4.

The opinion which we are repudiating is connected with the penal substitution theory of the atonement, that Christ endured in our stead the punishment due to human sinners. It has been shown in this volume that the sufferings of Christ were not penal, but constituted a voluntary and redemptive sacrifice for sin which was finished once for all by His death on the Cross. The conditions of death which pertain to our mortality He did undergo, because He truly endured human death; but that He should be tormented after death was both abhorrent to His character and unnecessary for His achievement of redemption.

§ 5. St. Peter writes that Christ was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit; in which He also went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which aforetime were disobedient, when the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing."[1] The natural sense of this is that when Christ descended into Hades He proclaimed the Gospel to the departed, in particular to certain who disobeyed the call of God on the eve of the deluge. No sufficient reason has been given for rejecting this interpretation, and no reasonable alternative for it has been discovered.[2]

[1] 1 St. Pet. iii. 18–20. Cf. iv. 6.

[2] Patristic interpretation is given by Cornel. A. Lapide, *in loc.* Huidekoper, *op. cit.*, pp. 48–49, 164–171, gives a historical survey. E. H. Plumptre, *op. cit.*, pp. 17 *et seq.*, 93 *et seq.*, 111–121, affirms

That Christ preached to the disobedient has been explained in several ways. It has been viewed as a judicial revelation to them of their forfeiture of salvation — an unlikely supposition. It has also been thought that the disobedient ones in question repented before passing from this world, and that on this basis Christ proclaimed salvation to them. It seems strange, however, on this supposition, that St. Peter should have mentioned their disobedience without hinting at their repentance.

The passage is difficult because of its brevity, but the most reasonable interpretation seems to be that the antedeluvians referred to continued in their disobedience, yet that the preaching of the Gospel to them was not useless. The reason would appear to be that their former disobedience was due to what was then invincible ignorance. If this interpretation is correct, the passage would seem to be an inspired warning against our assuming that the benefits of Christ's death are limited to those who accept the Gospel in this life. This subject will be taken up again in a later section.[1] In any case St. Peter clearly witnesses to the fact that our Lord in some manner[2] proclaimed the Gospel to

---

a preaching, and Bp. Pearson, art. V., fol. 228–229, 241–242, denies it. Cf. R. H. Charles, *Crit. Hist. of the Doctr. of a Fut. Life*, pp. 376–378; S. D. F. Salmond, *Christian Doctr. of Immortality*, pp. 456–488.

[1] In § 9 of this chapter.

[2] In a manner determined by His not then appearing or acting in the flesh, this lying in the tomb.

the dead during the interval between His death and resurrection.

§ 6. Whether at this time Christ descended into the lowest Hell, the place of the damned, we have left an open question. It does not need to be answered, in order to determine whether He then did anything in the way of spoiling the powers of darkness who dwell there. As St. Thomas shows,[1] our Lord did not have to enter locally the lowest Hell in order to extend His conquering power to that region. The power by which He worked was that of His passion, the virtue of which is not restricted to the place of His local presence. But whatever He did then He did for the dead; that is, for their deliverance by His passion from the power of Satan over them — in particular, from the power implied by their being called the "spirits in prison." This deliverance was necessarily confined to those who were still susceptible of salvation. It could not benefit the finally lost, because the virtue of His passion could not be extended to them.[2]

The mysterious appearance of many bodies of the saints in the holy city after our Lord's resurrection, described in the first Gospel,[3] would seem to show this at least, that when our Lord withdrew from Hell, He also delivered some at least of the

[1] *Summa Theol.*, III. lii. 2.

[2] St. Thomas, *op. cit.*, III. lii. 6.

[3] St. Matt. xxvii 52–53. See A. Plummer and Dean Alford, *in loc.*

spirits in prison. But this proves nothing as to what He did while He was in Hell, beyond preaching. As to the immediate effect of His preaching on those who accepted it, nothing can be said with certainty, except that they must have been relieved by His redemptive passion from effects of satanic power they had previously endured. Presumably this deliverance was not the same in immediate form for all. It seems unlikely that Abraham and other faithful patriarchs were then in a state of misery, whether penal or purgatorial, for our Lord appears to have accepted the current ideas involved in describing the place of the blessed dead as Abraham's bosom[1] and as a place of comfort.

The traditional conviction that since our Lord's death those who die in a state of salvation remain in an intermediate place of purification until made perfect, but that when perfected they enter into so much of the bliss of heaven as is involved in enjoyment of the beatific vision, has strong probability in its favour.[2] If this conviction is in accord with fact, our Lord's preaching must have brought hope to all who were not beyond the reach of saving grace, but for the time being must have left all of these, except perfected saints, in the intermediate place or state between Heaven and Hell.

[1] St. Luke xvi. 22.

[2] It has been the opinion of the bulk of catholic writers in all ages. St. Thomas, *op. cit.*, III. Suppl. lxix. 2: xciii. 1. The subject will be taken up in our last volume; but cf. *Theol. Outlines*, Q. 160. 2.

Apart from all these problems, the determination of which cannot be absolute in this world, it is certain that our Lord's descent into Hades, when considered along with His subsequent exaltation, reduced the power of Satan, led captivity captive and procured gifts for men.[1] His descent and ascent have therefore altered for the better the conditions of all who enter Hades in a state of salvation. Hades is thereby robbed of its terrors for them.

III. *Special Questions*

§ 7. Where is Hell? This question did not trouble Christian believers so long as the earth was regarded as a flat plane, having vast regions beneath; but the teaching of modern astronomy concerning the terrestrial sphere has disturbed many who wish to receive the teaching of Scripture and cling to its older or literal interpretation. Such interpretation involves us in patent difficulties; and the alleged lack of a suitable place in the universe, as we now know it, for either Heaven or Hell has thrown the question of their locality into solution.

It has come to be generally acknowledged that the scriptural descriptions of Heaven as up, and of Hell as down, or under the earth, are not to be pressed in their literal meaning. It is also recognized that,

[1] Eph. iv. 8–10. See E. H. Plumptre, *op. cit.*, pp. 75 *et seq.*; F. Huidekoper, *op. cit.* pp. 49–54, 66–78; R. E. Hutton, *Soul in the Unseen World*, pp. 161–168; J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Ignatius*, Vol. II. pp. 131–133, note.

if figurative terms of direction are to be used for the purpose of denoting places of happiness and misery respectively, "up" is a suitable indication of Heaven and "down" fittingly indicates Hell. And since the convenience of these figures of speech is derived in each case from the state of happiness or misery which is involved, the inference has been made that scriptural teaching does not commit us to belief in a local Heaven and a local Hell.[1] The modern denial that Heaven and Hell are local is also intensified by the unconsciously Manichæan prejudice, now widely prevailing, against the ancient catholic doctrine of the *resurrectio carnis* and of the part which our bodies play in the life of the world to come. The lack of adequate basis for this prejudice will appear when we come to deal with the resurrection of our Lord.

It is to be acknowledged that we cannot rightly interpret Scripture as revealing where Heaven and Hell are; but several reasons compel us to hold that our Lord and His Apostles taught a local Heaven and a local Hell, without defining where they are. The figures "up" and "down" do not stand alone, and the various modes of indicating Heaven and Hell in the New Testament agree in implying their local delimitation. The narrative of the rich man

[1] Such a generally sound writer as W. Milligan, *Ascension*, pp. 20–27, describes Heaven as a state rather than a locality. We do not deny that the change of state is the *more prominent* aspect of Heaven in many biblical references to it.

and Lazarus is a case in point.[1] There is also the teaching that Christ descended into Hades after His death. This descent is not naturally to be interpreted as a mere entrance into a lower state — the state of the departed. Still less can we interpret our Lord's bodily ascension and disappearance in a cloud [2] as a going nowhere. That His body was real, that locality is a necessary condition of body, and that our Lord plainly meant to indicate by His visible movement a local withdrawal to some invisible region, seems too clear for dispute except by those who deny the facts given in the Gospel narratives of our Lord's post-resurrection appearances.

If Heaven and Hell are merely states of happiness and misery, it is hard to understand the consistent adherence of the New Testament to local terms of identification. The idea of states is not an obscure one, not one which requires local figures for its expression. Any adequate conception of our Lord's Person requires us to believe that He would not have resorted to such descriptions if they were false and calculated to create carnal notions. The fact is that the pure state theory is contrary to any known creaturely possibilities. Neither experience nor reflection on the essentially finite limitations of human nature permit us to suppose that we shall hereafter transcend the law of spatial or local pres-

[1] St. Luke xvi. 22–26.

[2] St. Luke xxiv. 51; Acts i. 9–11. Cf. St. Mark app. xvi. 19. See ch. ix. §§ 5–6, below.

ence. To be somewhere appears to be an unescapable condition of existence for both our bodies and our spirits; and there is no reason to suppose that any change which leaves us finite can reverse this law.

Where, then, is Heaven, and where is Hell? We do not need to know, and we are not told. It is undoubtedly best that we should not know while confronted by present probationary responsibilities. They may be close at hand, and they may be distant. But if distant beyond our extremest range of computing, the problem of time and of speed in reaching them need not trouble us; for these are relative measures, which need not be restricted to terms of our present experience and imagination. For all we know, a billion light years of space can be traversed in the twinkling of an eye under the conditions of life beyond the grave. We can indeed determine where Heaven and Hell are in relative terms. Heaven is where our Lord's glorified body is, and Hell is where the devil and lost spirits are. Beyond this we cannot go.[1]

§ 8. A second question is concerned with the meaning of Christ when He said to the penitent thief, "To-day shalt thou be with Me, in Paradise."[2] Is Paradise equivalent to Hades, or, as a vast majority of Christians have always believed, to Heaven? If Paradise properly denotes Heaven, why should Christ

[1] See Hastings, *Dic. of Bible*, *s. v.* "Heaven," p. 323; *Dic. of Christ*, *q. v.* p. 712; Blunt, *Dic. of Theol.*, *q. v.*, III.

[2] St. Luke xxiii. 43.

have described the place of the thief's presence with Him as Paradise, in view of His descent into Hell?

These questions are not difficult to answer. The term "Paradise" is not one that has always had a fixed reference, except in the one particular that it connotes pleasure, and the enjoyment of divine blessing.[1] It has signified the garden of Eden, and Abraham's bosom. To Christians it signifies where Christ is, and that is now Heaven. This it must have signified to the penitent thief — with the Lord to whom he had turned for help in the hour of death. The meaning of Christ can be paraphrased, "To-day shalt thou be with Me, and therefore in Paradise." To be with Him was the greatest joy then possible for the penitent thief, and to be there, even though in Hell, was to be in Paradise.[2]

§ 9. Finally, there is a question suggested by our Lord's preaching to the spirits in prison: How far does our Lord's death avail to make possible the salvation of those who are not in this life afforded the knowledge of redemption and grace?[3] What-

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 4; Revel. ii. 7. Cf. Gen. ii. 8. The word means a park or pleasure ground.

[2] On paradise and related questions, see R. E. Hutton, *Soul in the Unseen World*, ch. ix; Bp. Pearson, fol. 357, 359; *Trid. Catech.*, ch. x. q. 5; *Westminster Confess.*, ch. xxxiii; A. P. Forbes, *Nicene Creed*, pp. 269–271, 314, 328–331; Blunt, *Theol. Dic.*, *s. v.* "Beatific Vision."

[3] Discussed usually in connection with *limbus puerorum*. See *Cath. Encyc.*, *s. v.* "Limbo," I; St. Thomas, III. Suppl. lxxi; E. B. Pusey, *What is of Faith*, pp. 8–11; P. J. Toner, "Lot of Those Dying in Original Sin," in *Irish Theol. Qly.*, July, 1909.

ever answer is given to this question must be in harmony with what is clearly revealed — in particular, (*a*) that no salvation can be had except through Jesus Christ,[1] and on the basis of His death; and (*b*) that no hope of salvation remains for those who in this life wilfully reject the means of salvation when effectively made known to them.[2]

The Scriptures are given for the guidance of those who have received the Gospel message, and both their promises and their warnings are determined in form by this fact. They do not therefore afford any direct and specific teaching on this subject. The rebuke with which our Lord met St. Peter's question about St. John's manner of death[3] implies this at least, that our own following of Christ is a task of too absorbing requirements to leave room for useless curiosity about the future of those whose conditions differ from our own. To us the vital question must always be, How shall we most fully respond to our own Christian calling?

Yet the question before us cannot be totally ignored under modern conditions, for while it cannot be answered more definitely than Holy Scripture answers it, we have to formulate the principles which are involved in its solution, lest we seem to acquiesce in the popular notion that our faith commits us to

[1] St. John xiv. 6; Acts iv. 12.
[2] St. John xii. 48. Cf. Heb. vi. 4–6; x. 26–31.
[3] St. John xxi. 20–22.

a hopeless view of the future of the heathen and of infants who die unbaptized.[1]

That our Lord should have preached to ignorant spirits beyond the grave seems to imply that divine resources for the enlightenment and salvation of men are not restricted in their benefits to the living; and this surely opens a door of hope which we may not close. The gracious truth that God willeth all men to be saved,[2] a truth which we might infer from what we know of the divine character even if it were not expressly declared, also justifies the conviction that nothing short of wilful rejection of salvation can bar out all the benefits of Christ's death. Then, too, we know that "particular redemption," or the notion that Christ died only for the elect, is a wretched travesty of New Testament doctrine.[3] Again, we are assured that the Judge of all the earth will do right; and it does not seem right to us that partiality should limit divine mercy, or that God should condemn to everlasting punishment those to whom He has given no chance of salvation. Finally, we are assured that the judgment according to the deeds done in the body is a discriminating judgment, which allows for the comparative degrees

[1] On infants dying unbaptized, see D. Stone, *Holy Baptism*, pp. 111–112, 115–116. He also gives the views of ancient and scholastic writers, with refs., in note on p. 260. Cf. *Cath. Encyc.*, *s. v.* "Baptism," XI.

[2] 1 Tim. ii. 4.

[3] Cf. ch. ii. § 4, above.

of knowledge and "talents" providentially afforded to each.[1]

In view of these fundamental facts and truths of Scripture, we are driven to believe that all men will be afforded, either in this life or in the next, an opportunity of benefiting by Christ's death, and that none will be lost except through wilful misuse or rejection of such opportunity. But this conclusion is less determinate as to the nature of opportunities and of the benefits made available than is sometimes supposed; and it does not imply probation after death, in the proper sense of that word, that is, a chance to reverse the effects of probation in this world.

Probation[2] involves opportunity to form and reveal one's attitude towards such light and grace as is enjoyed in this life, and every human agent does enjoy some light, and presumably some elementary form of prevenient grace. To many the opportunities are very small indeed, but all races have conceptions, however grotesque, of right and wrong; and therefore all have a real probation — a real test of their disposition to respond to moral and spiritual challenges as they understand them.[3] The supposition that the

[1] Cf. St. Matt. xxv. 14–30; Heb. iv. 15–16.

[2] Probation after death will be considered in our last volume. Cf. however, *Theol. Outlines*, Q. 159; D. Stone, pp. 241–243; D. W. Forrest, *Authority of Christ*, pp. 323–331; Jas. Denney, *Studies in Theol.*, pp. 241–246; Jas. Orr, *Christ. View of God*, pp. 343–346; *Cath. Encyc.*, *s. v.* "Judgment," III.

[3] The description of the judgment reported as given by Christ in St. Matt. xxv. 32–46, implies that men may be working out their

fundamental disposition thus developed and brought to light would be reversed under Christian conditions is not susceptible of proof. The most that can be said is that larger opportunities will secure the reversal of the unwitting mistakes of those rightly disposed towards truth; that is, they will benefit those who did what they could be expected to do with their small opportunities. The New Testament plainly implies that the final judgment will be concerned with the deeds done in the body.[1]

This teaching seems to show that death ends every man's opportunity to become salvable; and opportunities after death, whatever they may be, seem to be limited in their scope to fuller enlightenment, correction of mistakes and the growth in grace of those who have already shown moral susceptibility to its saving benefits. In this connection we have to remember that the Judge is omniscient and all-wise; and He is far more capable of allowing for things that should be allowed for, and of discerning the real bent of souls under all circumstances, than we can imagine. The supposition that He will condemn those who might have been saved under more favorable oppor-

---

salvation by lines of action the Christian significance of which is unknown to them.

[1] Cf. 2 Cor. v. 10; vi. 2; St. Matt. xvi. 27; St. Luke xii. 47–48; xix. 12–26; St. John ix. 4; Heb. ix. 27; 1 St. Pet. i. 17; Revel. ii. 23; xx. 12; xxii. 12. The case of those dying in infancy requires special consideration. They have no experience which can be called probational, but their innocence, fixed by death, may have more value than we know and may secure their salvability.

tunities in this life is incredible — as much so to one who rejects the theory of a probation after death as to one who accepts it. This theory is quite unnecessary for the vindication of either the justice or the love of our divine Judge.

It is widely assumed that the form of beatification promised to faithful Christians is for all men the sole alternative to everlasting punishment. This assumption cannot be proved. There may be, so far as we know, other Heavens open for those who are not elected to life in this world. The view that there is a future middle state of permanent nature has given comfort to many.[1] And it is possible that the inequality of opportunities in this world is related to difference of vocations appointed for the world to come. At all events, if the missionary task is to complete the number of the "elect," we need not infer that "non-elect" signifies lack of any divine provision and vocation, of any possibility of reward calculated to satisfy its recipients, and of any fitting home and function in the future realms of divine goodness.

[1] *Cath. Encyc.*, *s. v.* "Limbo," II; P. J. Toner, "Lot of Those Dying in Original Sin," *Irish Theol. Qly.*, July, 1909.

CHAPTER VI

THE FACT OF THE RESURRECTION

I. *Standpoints and Approaches*

§ 1. The fact of the resurrection, as traditionally viewed,[1] is that on the third day, Jewish reckoning, after a true death and burial, our Lord rose again in the flesh, and on various occasions during the ensuing forty days appeared alive to His followers. That His resurrection body displayed new and strange

[1] On the general subject, see St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, III. liii–lvi; W. Milligan, *Resurrection of our Lord;* W. J. S. Simpson, *Our Lord's Resurrection;* and *The Resurrection and Modern Thought;* Hastings, *Dic. of Christ*, and Blunt, *Dic. of Theol.*, *s. vv.* "Resurrection of Christ"; *Cath. Encyc.*, *s. v.* "Resurrection," I; Bp. Pearson, *Apos. Creed*, art. v.

On the facts and evidence, see *Church Qly. Review*, Jan., 1906, art. IV; McC. Edgar, *Gospel of a Risen Saviour;* John Kennedy, *Resurrection of Jesus Christ;* Chas. Gore, *New Theol. and the Old Relig.*, pp. 118–125; E. H. Day, *Evid. for the Resurrection;* Jas. Orr, *Resurrection of Jesus;* G. P. Fisher, *Grounds of Theistic and Christ. Belief*, ch. ix; A. C. Headlam, *Miracles of the N. Test.*, Lec. vi; Chas. Harris, *Pro Fide*, ch. xxii; T. Christlieb, *Modern Doubt*, Lec. vii; T. J. Thorburn, *The Resurrection Narratives;* H. B. Swete, *Appearances of Our Lord after the Passion;* H. Latham, *Risen Master;* Max Meinertz, "The Fact of the Resurrection," *Constructive Quarterly*, Mch. 1915.

Authors only will ordinarily be given in references to the above mentioned works.

properties and capacities is clearly shown in the Gospel descriptions of His appearances, but that it was identical in substance with the body which hung on the Cross is a vital part of the traditional interpretation of the Gospel narratives.[1]

The rational credibility of these narratives as thus interpreted depends, of course, upon the standpoint from which the subject is considered, and upon the method of our approach to the question.

In this, as in several other connections previously dealt with in this series of volumes, the standpoint of naturalism is encountered. Accordingly, although we have more than once criticized this theory — it has no higher claim to acceptance than that of extra-scientific speculation — the necessity of comprehensive treatment of so central a mystery as that of the resurrection constrains us once more to summarize our reasons for rejecting it.[2] Its acceptance is obviously fatal to belief in our Lord's bodily resurrection. This is so because naturalism denies that

[1] Cf. the Apostles' Creed, "The third day He rose again from the dead"; the Nicene Creed, "And the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures"; and *Articles of Religion*, iv, "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature, wherewith He ascended," etc. That the primitive Christians believed in such a resurrection, see J. Orr, pp. 33–42. He gives a clear description of present forms of attack in ch. i.

[2] On naturalism, see *Creation and Man*, pp. 109–112; *The Incarnation*, pp. 9–11, 320–326; *Evolution and the Fall*, pp. 21–36; Jas. Ward, *Naturalism and Agnosticism;* A. J. Balfour, *Foundations of Belief;* R. Otto, *Naturalism and Religion.* Cf. J. Orr, pp. 44–53.

human experience can include any event that cannot be explained by the factors and laws which the physical and mechanical sciences are able to explore and describe.

That these sciences cannot consistently with their scope and methods take cognizance of such phenomena as are recorded in the resurrection narratives is obvious. But this arises from the limitations of these sciences, which have to do with such phenomena only as are susceptible of physical and mechanical generalization. All other phenomena are necessarily excluded from consideration so long as the avowed aim of physical scientists is pursued. When these scientists, however, declare that no phenomena can come within human observation except those which lie within the scope of physical generalizations, they venture into an extra-scientific field and indulge in an *à priori* dogmatism for which their specialized methods of inquiry afford no basis. Just such dogmatism is the distinguishing mark of naturalism, which is therefore an *à priori* philosophy, having no right to be described as scientific.

Moreover, it is inconsistent with that large group of daily observed phenomena into which personal factors enter. That physical events are altered in their course by superphysical and personal intervention and manipulation of physical things and forces, is too patent to be reasonably denied. To give an example, while physical laws are utilized in printing a book they are also transcended, and the

product cannot be adequately described and interpreted by the methods of physical science. A higher factor than the physical sciences can bring within the range of their generalizations is needed to explain the phenomenon.

There survives among many who occupy the naturalistic standpoint the deistic conception of the universe as a complex and self-sufficient mechanism, which even its Creator cannot manipulate without violating its laws and upsetting its harmonious order.[1] This conception is also purely *à priori*, and rests upon no scientific evidence. The universe is more than a physical cosmos. It is also the manifestation of an immanent personal Worker,[2] and may be likened to the scenery of a drama in which there is an evolving plot to which occasional shiftings of the physical scenery suitably minister. As the stage-manager is the all-wise God, these shiftings necessarily reflect His wisdom. They fit in with the drama as a whole; and, so far from disturbing its sequences, they facilitate and interpret them. But the deistic conception is inconsistent with belief in a really living and personal God, with divine immanence, and with the possibility that the history of the universe should mean anything or minister to anything.

[1] On deism, see A. S. Farrar, *Hist. of Free Thought*, Lec. iv; H. P. Liddon, *Some Elements of Religion*, pp. 55–59; Hastings, *Encyc. of Religion*, *q. v.*, where bibliog. is given.

[2] Cf. *Creation and Man*, pp. 69–72; *Being and Attrib. of God*, pp. 263–264, 286–288 (other refs. on p. 286, n. 2).

The principle of continuity is determined in application by the nature of that to which it is applied. In a deistic and naturalistic universe, every miracle would constitute a breach of continuity; and so would instances of personal control of events therein — such, for example, as the history of human invention and applied science brings to light. But in a world-drama, a breach of continuity means an event which has no rational place in the progressive working out of the plot. Men can cause such breaches of continuity, for they can act capriciously, and human sin is their irrational caprice. But one who attains to the Christian conception of God naturally believes Him to be incapable of caprice. And his belief in the fact of the resurrection, based in the first instance upon the contents of apostolic testimony, is given its vital strength by the determinative place and illuminative value which he perceives that event to have in the world-drama.[1]

§ 2. A somewhat subtle form of the naturalistic standpoint is adopted by those who depend exclusively upon what is called the historical method in investigating the narratives of the resurrection. The importance of this method in the study of New Testament documents is now too well established to be disregarded.[2] And it has to be utilized to a de-

[1] On which, see ch. viii. §§ 5–8, below.

[2] On this, see Robert Mackintosh, in Hastings, *Dic. of Christ*, *s. v.* "Historical"; K. Lake, *Hist. Evid. for the Resurrection*, pp. 5–7 (with naturalistic bias). Cf. J. Kennedy, pp. 11–24.

gree in any thorough scrutiny of the resurrection narratives. But these narratives obtrude problems and factors which do not lie within the scope of the generalizations of historical science, and which cannot be fully dealt with by its methods, for these methods are based upon generalizations in which natural events alone are reckoned with.

To insist that such generalizations can be depended upon to determine all that can be determined as to any alleged event whatsoever, obviously involves the assumption that an event which cannot be brought within the range of natural occurrences, with which historical science exclusively concerns itself, cannot happen. In brief, one who depends exclusively upon the historical method in investigating the fact of the resurrection starts with a postulate which begs the question at issue — the postulate that nothing happens which transcends the generalizations of historical science.

The bodily resurrection of Christ involves factors, and appeals to reasons for belief, which lie outside the purview of historical science, as ordinarily understood. Accordingly, while the historical method is rightly employed for throwing light on certain branches of the problem, other lines of inquiry are also necessary for adequate investigation. And the fact that the bodily resurrection of Christ cannot be established by an exclusive use of the historical method does not of itself prove the lack of sufficient reasons for belief in it.

Dr. Lake rightly maintains the need of having regard for intrinsic probabilities in inquiries of this kind.[1] But estimates of intrinsic probability are necessarily controlled by the standpoint of the inquirer. If this standpoint is wholly that of historical science in its accepted sense, that is, if the so called historical method is regarded as alone to be utilized, the intrinsic probability that certain elements of the Gospel narratives agree with the experiences from which they were ultimately derived is very slight, for the special limitations of historical science make for incredulity in the presence of such narratives. But if the traditional Christian standpoint is assumed, the intrinsic probabilities will be quite differently estimated; for Christian believers allow for factors and reasons of which historical science cannot take account without departing from its chosen province.[2]

If St. Luke's narrative, for example, is substantially true to fact, the resurrection was an absolutely unique event, and one which enlisted factors that have in no other instance come within human experience. Therefore the generalizations and rules of historical inquiry cannot, when *exclusively* employed, enable us either to demonstrate its reality or to overthrow its credibility.

§ 3. Another standpoint which determines men's estimates of the resurrection narratives is the Mani-

[1] *The Hist. Evid. for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, pp. 167–169.

[2] See W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, ch. xxx. Cf. § 4, below.

chæan.[1] This standpoint is rarely retained in its unqualified form among modern thinkers, and it would be difficult to find to-day a defender of the proposition that matter or flesh is intrinsically evil. But the idea that there is some kind of incongruity between matter and spirit, and a certain incurable opposition between flesh and spirit in human nature, continues to exercise a strong influence over many minds. This influence is felt even by thinkers who would hesitate to acknowledge it, who would at least shrink from accepting the implied postulate that the lines on which the Creator has built human nature are wrong, and that they need to be reversed in a vital particular before our nature can become what it ought to be. The omnipresent fact of human sin has caused a universal conflict in this world between the human flesh and spirit, which because of its universality is hastily assumed to be intrinsic, and to require the spirit's permanent escape from its physical organism, if it is to attain to its appointed perfection and destiny.

Some of those who make this inference are willing to acknowledge that the body does in certain ways serve the purposes of its animating spirit, but they maintain that this service is temporary and confined to this world, matter being unsuited for the full

[1] On Manichæism, see J. F. Bethune-Baker, pp. 93–95; *Cath. Encyc.*, *s. vv.* "Manichæism"; and "Evil," II; *Dic. of Christ. Biog.*, *s. v.* "Manichæans"; A. Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, Vol. III. pp. 316–336.

functioning and self-expression of personality. By those who thus view the body it is sometimes likened to scaffolding, which ministers to the raising of the edifice which it envelops, but cannot be allowed to remain if the finished building is to be conveniently employed and to exhibit its form and beauty. This line of argument undoubtedly leaves room for acknowledging the goodness of God in creating the body, but is utterly inadequate to the honourable place and functions assigned to the body in New Testament doctrine. There remains the assumption that matter is incongruous with the spirit in its perfection. The significant fact that, in this life at least, the advance of our spirits towards perfection draws with it a more and more harmonious relation between the flesh and the spirit is disregarded, as is also the increasing success with which the visage of an aged saint reveals even to imperfect earthly observers the sanctified spirit within.

As we hope to show later on,[1] various lines of inquiry afford reasons for caution in limiting the degree of service to spirit, and to its self-expression, of which the body is capable when human nature has reached its heavenly perfection. The point to which we now draw attention is that to assume at the outset — no one can prove it — that a material body cannot become fitted for the spirit's use under the perfected conditions of the world to come is to beg the question as to the truth of the resurrection narratives.

[1] In ch. vii. §§ 11–12.

Except in the one particular of His flesh having seen no corruption, our Lord's resurrection is plainly treated in Scripture as the pattern of ours, and more than one of His post-resurrection appearances is declared to have been attended by incidents to show that He had been raised in real flesh. The alternative remains, therefore, of either reconsidering the disparaging view above described of the possibilities of flesh in the service of glorified spirit, or of being unable to take seriously the evidence of the nature of our Lord's resurrection which the Gospels afford.

§ 4. From the nature of the case no evidence of the reality of a past event can be obtained, or even imagined, that will convince one who retains a point of view which precludes the possibility of its occurrence. But the difficulty is due to the handicap of alien standpoints, rather than to an insufficiency of reasons for the traditional Christian belief. The formal or external evidences of the fact are available to all readers of the New Testament, but their sufficiency appears only when considerations are reckoned with which the standpoints above described drive out of sight.[1]

The Christian standpoint permits one to do entire justice to those aspects of the universe or world-process which natural science describes in terms of law, uniformity and continuity; but it is determined

[1] Considerations which convert intrinsic improbability into intrinsic probability, and thus enable us to perceive the force of the evidence.

by belief in the higher and dramatic aspect of world-history, as the working out of a divine plot or plan — a plan which involves occasional innovations upon the normal course of phenomena, due to the entrance of higher factors than can be reckoned with in the generalizations of natural science. When regarded from such a standpoint, the credibility of the miracle of the resurrection, and the sufficiency of the evidence given for it, is estimated in the light of the significant place and illuminative value which that event appears to have in the world-drama or divine plan. Its relatedness to history at large, as thus regarded, gives it a credibility which it could not have if it were simply a meaningless prodigy.

The Christian view of history affords an illuminating background to the evidence for the resurrection; and this background imparts to this evidence a convincing value that is sufficient to overcome the natural unreadiness of men to believe in so stupendous a miracle. In saying this, we assume, of course, that the inquirer approaches the subject in a spiritual frame of mind. The credibility of the resurrection is to a high degree spiritual; and without the gift of spiritual discernment no one, however acute his scholarly gifts may be, can rightly expect to be able accurately to weigh the value of its evidence.[1]

The Christian view makes Jesus Christ to be truly divine, the Mediator between God and man, whose

[1] Cf. *Introd. to Dogm. Theol.*, ch. ix. Pt. III; B. F. Westcott, *Gospel of the Resurrection*, ch. i.

manifestation in human history is the chief crisis in the whole world-drama, and the most significant shifting of the scenery thereof that has come within human experience. It elevates Christ's death into a redemptive mystery, which requires for completion His full victory over the grave.[1] It interprets this redemption in the light of revelation at large, as designed ultimately to recover our entire nature from corruption, — no element therein being superfluous to the purpose of the immortality which Jesus Christ brought to light,[2] and to the future human functioning whereby the incarnate Son of God is to be glorified and to be forever preëminent in and over all creation, visible and invisible.[3] The immortality revealed by Christ is a richer thing than a mere survival of the human ego, and is not to be lowered to the level of the continuance in existence of disembodied souls which the pagan Plato tried to prove.[4]

Accordingly, the bodily resurrection of Christ, so far from looking like a contra-natural breach in the continuity of the visible order, brings with it such a splendid vindication of that order, and such an illuminating conception of the entire world-process, that it seems, as it were, to *prove itself* as an inevitable crisis in the world-movement, and as the most rational and significant event known to man.

[1] Cf. ch. iii. § 7, above; ch. viii. § 7, below; and *passim*.
[2] 2 Tim. i. 10.
[3] Cf. Eph. i. 10, 20–22; Col. i. 18–20.
[4] *Creation and Man*, pp. 209–212.

II. *The Evidence*

§ 5. The considerations which impart credibility to the evidence for the resurrection do not displace the need of that evidence. They indeed prove nothing apart from it; and the necessity of exhibiting real evidence is clear, if the traditional belief in the resurrection is to be reasonably justified.[1]

The testimony of St. Paul[2] takes the first place in this evidence, partly because it is earliest, being generally acknowledged to have been given about 55 A.D., and partly because it embodies knowledge which is still nearer to the event with which it is concerned. St. Paul declares that he had already preached to them, and they had believed in his testimony, an obvious reference to his visit in Corinth, 50 A.D. He also speaks of having "received" what he was testifying,[3] and in another epistle he writes of having verified the agreement of the Gospel which he had for many years been preaching with that of the Apostles in Jerusalem,[4] whose knowledge was obviously of earlier origin than his. He asserts to the Corinthians the apostolic authority

[1] For bibliography on the evidence for the resurrection, see p. 164. n. 1, above.

[2] Found chiefly in 1 Cor. xv. See W. J. S. Simpson, *Resurrection and Modern Thought*, chh. viii–xiii; *Our Lord's Resurrection*, pp. 106–143; W. Milligan, pp. 39–45; John Kennedy, ch. iii; Chas. Harris, pp. 464–480; T. Christlieb, pp. 476–490; B. W. Randolph, *The Empty Tomb*.

[3] 1 Cor. xv. 1–3.

[4] Gal. ii. 1–2.

and representative value of his testimony to them, saying, "Whether then it be I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed." [1]

His testimony falls well within the life-time of those whom he declared to have seen the risen Lord, over two hundred and fifty of them being asserted to be still alive; [2] and no sufficient time had elapsed for the development of either myth [3] or legend. His testimony is in full accord with what St. Luke describes as the pentecostal preaching of St. Peter.[4] And the younger Saul cannot have been ignorant of the nature of this preaching when he persecuted the Church of God, certainly within six years of the crucifixion.[5] The event of Easter morn, whatever it was, did not happen in a corner,[6] and the apostolic description of it must have been known to a wide circle very soon after St. Peter's pentecostal sermon.[7]

The testimony of St. Paul contains two main branches: (*a*) that after dying and being buried,

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 11.

[2] Verse 6.

[3] The myth theory of Strauss, first *Life of Jesus*, is now antiquated. There is another form of it in Jas. Martineau's *Seat of Authority*, pp. 358–377. The current attempt to prove that Jesus Christ never lived, of J. M. Robertson, W. B. Smith, A. Drews, etc., is hardly worth serious attention; but see T. J. Thorburn, *Jesus the Christ: Historical or Mythical;* S. J. Case, *The Historicity of Jesus.*

[4] Acts ii. 23–32. Cf. iii. 14–15; iv. 2, 10.

[5] Acts vii. 58; viii. 1, 3.

[6] Acts xxvi. 22–26.

[7] Cf. the conversion of 3000 souls by that sermon, Acts ii. 41. See Jas. Orr, pp. 84–86.

Christ "hath been raised on the third day"; (*b*) that He appeared several times to various followers, on one occasion to above five hundred at once, — the greater part of them remaining "until now," — and last of all to St. Paul himself.[1]

The event is described as an event of "the third day," and as a resurrection — not as a manifestation of mere personal survival after death. The previous mention of the burial also suggests that the resurrection referred to is from the tomb from which He was buried, a resurrection in terms of body and of both time and space. The list of appearances is not given as exhaustive, but is obviously selected with reference to their convincing value to the Corinthians. Accordingly they are limited to appearances to the apostolic leaders, to the multitude and to himself. Their order seems to be chronological, but it is not said to be so, and the testimony is not weakened, therefore, by failure to demonstrate its accuracy in this regard. The assertion that over two hundred and fifty of those who had seen the risen Lord were still living was a daring one, if St. Paul was not convinced of its truth.

It is objected that St. Paul is silent as to the empty grave, a very necessary link in the evidence of a bodily resurrection. The reply is that St. Paul gives a rapid reminder of what he declared that he had already preached to the Corinthians, and does not offer an exhaustive survey of the evidence. But,

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 4–8.

as has already been indicated, the series of assertions, "died," "buried" and "hath been raised on the third day," plainly implies an emptying of the grave on the third day.

It is also objected that St. Paul makes no distinction between the appearances to the others and that to himself, and this shows that all of them were visions rather than objective appearances. But St. Paul evidently did not regard the appearance to himself as a mere vision, and elsewhere shows his ability to distinguish between an objective appearance and a vision.[1] His Greek word for appeared, ὤφθη, is normally employed in the New Testament for objective manifestations.[2] Moreover, the physical and blinding effect of his experience points to a real manifestation.[3]

§ 6. A third objection concerns the nature of the bodily resurrection which St. Paul intended to affirm, and also raises the question as to whether the Gospel narratives agree with St. Paul's testimony. Briefly stated, it is that the kind of resurrection to which St. Paul bears witness in Christ's case must agree with that which, in the same connection, he asserts to be in store for us; because he bases the assurance of our resurrection upon the certainty of His, and upon Christ's having become "the First-

[1] Cf. 2 Cor. xii. 1–4; Acts xviii. 9–10.

[2] When a vision is referred to it is somehow indicated by the context. *E.g.* St. Luke i. 22.

[3] It is described by St. Luke in Acts ix. 3–8, who reports St. Paul's own description in chh. xxii. 7–11; xxvi. 12–15.

fruits of them that are asleep." But he teaches, it is urged, that our resurrection is to be purely spiritual, acknowledging that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God."[1] Dr. Lake seems to recognize that St. Paul ascribes the death and resurrection to the same body, σῶμα, numerically speaking, but interprets him as teaching what is in effect a transubstantiation of the material body into spirit.[2] Such a conclusion, if valid, puts St. Paul in opposition both to certain elements in the Gospel narratives,[3] and to the traditional doctrine of the Church in subsequent centuries — a somewhat radical result; but, as we shall see, it is really non-relevant to St. Paul's argument.

St. Paul certainly says that "flesh and blood cannot inherit,"[4] but in itself the phrase cannot be shown to mean more than that flesh and blood have no power *in themselves* — no natural power — to inherit. Whether this acknowledgment was part of a more comprehensive assertion that they *will* not even be enabled to inherit, must be determined by the context. The determinative elements of the context are a previous antithesis between the pre-resurrection σῶμα ψυχικόν and the post-resurrection σῶμα πνευματικόν,[5] and a subsequent statement that

[1] So Kirsopp Lake, *The Hist. Evid. for the Resurrection*, pp. 20–23.

[2] As cited.

[3] Cf. St. Matt. xxviii. 9; St. Luke xxiv. 16, 30–31, 39–43; St. John xx. 20, 27, 29. Also Acts x. 41.

[4] 1 Cor. xv. 50.

[5] Verse 44.

this mortal and corruptible shall put on immortality and incorruption by a sudden change at the last trump.[1] In the light of this subsequent statement, the thought of St. Paul seems to be that, although flesh and blood, being mortal and corruptible, have no natural power to inherit the kingdom of God, the body containing these elements will none the less be enabled thus to inherit by a change, impliedly from above, wherein it will put on immortality and incorruption.

Moreover, the nature of this change from mortality to immortality, so far as St. Paul undertakes to describe it at all, is signified by his antithesis between σῶμα ψυχικόν and σῶμα πνευματικόν. It is a pity that the first of these phrases is translated "natural body," even in the Revised Version; for this translation has perpetuated the mistaken idea that it signifies a body made up of matter, as opposed to one consisting of spirit. Dr. Lake appears to take this for granted, and does not give to the antithesis the deliberate examination which its critical place in St. Paul's argument requires. St. Paul here contrasts a psychic body and a pneumatic body — one dominated by the *psyche* or animal soul and the other controlled by the higher *pneuma* or spirit. He is not at all contrasting bodies in relation to the nature of their substance, but in relation to their dominating principle, whether the ψυχή or the πνεῦμα. Inasmuch as neither ψυχή nor πνεῦμα denote material substance,

[1] Verses 51–54. Cf. verse 43.

ψυχικόν and πνευματικόν may not be taken to indicate a contrast between matter and spirit.

St. Paul's real thought, therefore, appears to be that whereas the σῶμα in this life is controlled by the lower animal soul, it will be brought by the resurrection under the control of man's higher rational spirit, and that this change will also endow the σῶμα with immortality and incorruptibility, imparting to it the power which flesh and blood does not naturally possess, the power to inherit the kingdom of God. At all events, there is no trace in St. Paul of the idea that the resurrection transubstantiates our material bodies into spirit. Such a conception of our resurrection seems remote from his sequence of descriptive terms, "buried" and "raised," or "sown" and "raised"; and his retention of the term σῶμα in both branches of his antithesis, above discussed, appears incongruous with the supposition that he had in mind a mode of post-resurrection existence in which a genuine σῶμα could have no part. Elsewhere, writing to the same Corinthians, he describes his hope: "not for that we would be unclothed, but that we would be clothed upon, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life";[1] and such language fits ill with the thought of the transubstantiation of our bodies into spirit.

The sum of the argument of this section is that the modern scholars who have adopted the inter-

[1] 2 Cor. v. 4. It is the body's mortality, not the body itself, that is swallowed up of life.

pretation of St. Paul which we have been criticizing and have depended upon it as affording reason for rejecting the evidence in the Gospels that Christ's resurrection body contained flesh and bones, have reason for reconsidering their interpretation. St. Paul's testimony cannot be shown to disagree in this regard with the Gospel narratives of the resurrection.[1]

§ 7. Whatever may be the general conclusion which one adopts with regard to the synoptic problem, the variations between the several accounts of the resurrection contained in the synoptic Gospels are too numerous and too significant to permit their being regarded as merely variants of one tradition or of one documentary source.[2] In particular, if negative critics are led to hypothecate two independent traditions concerning our Lord's post-resurrection appearances to the Apostles, the Galilæan and the Judæan, they are precluded from treating the agreements between the synoptic Gospels as having no corroborative value. They certainly should be taken to have such value, unless their mutual divergences are such as to discredit them — a matter which will be considered in due order. The fourth Gospel has suffered much disparagement in modern days, but its historical value is coming to be more adequately

[1] A résumé of St. Paul's teaching is given in another connection in ch. vii. § 10, below.

[2] The writer accepts, not without hesitation, the view of the synoptic problem given by L. Pullan, *The Gospels*, ch. iii, as the most defensible under present conditions of knowledge. But cf. Jas. Orr, pp. 61–79.

realized. It embodies independent testimony, as does also its appended chapter.

We have neither space nor call to analyze the Gospel testimonies critically in all their details. We content ourselves with outlining the events to which they testify.[1] They all testify to the reality of Christ's death by crucifixion, and of His burial in a tomb, before which a stone was rolled.[2] St. Matthew speaks of a soldier's guard being set.[3] Their accounts of the resurrection morning differ in details selected for mention, and do not afford sufficient data for determining with certainty the precise sequence of events. But if the several Gospel accounts are all accepted, the events to be reckoned with include the following:[4] 1. The women carried spices to the tomb quite early on the resurrection morning;[5] 2. An earthquake took place, and an angel descended, rolled away the stone, and sat on it. The soldiers appointed to guard the tomb were greatly frightened;[6]

[1] Some modern scholars seek to base their conclusions touching the resurrection on what they call the primitive traditions and sources lying behind the Gospels: these are at best conjectural. Our argument is based upon existing documents, known to have been produced in the apostolic age and among those who had witnessed the post-resurrection appearances. Cf. Jas. Orr, pp. 84–86.

[2] St. John's witness as to the stone is indirect, in ch. xx. 20. Cf. Jas. Orr, ch. iv.

[3] Ch. xxvii. 62–66.

[4] No attempt is made to determine their precise temporal sequence.

[5] St. Matt. xviii. 1; St. Mark xvi. 1–2. St. Matthew does not mention the spices.

[6] St. Matt. xxviii. 2–4.

3. The women found the tomb open[1] and a young man sitting,[2] who announced that Christ was not there but was risen, and bade them tell the Apostles that they would see Him in Galilee;[3] 4. Christ appeared to the women after they had left the tomb and reiterated the message to the disciples.[4] They then went and told the disciples,[5] who disbelieved;[6] 5. The soldiers reported what they had seen to the chief priests, and were bribed to spread the story that the disciples stole their Master's body while they themselves slept;[7] 6. Mary Magdalene, after finding the tomb empty, told Peter and John, who ran to the tomb and found the body gone, but the clothes lying there.[8] John believed;[9] 7. Mary Magdalene, lingering at the tomb, saw two angels;

[1] St. Matt. xxviii. 2, 5; St. Mark xvi. 5. St. Luke (xxiv. 1–3) adds that they found not the body.

[2] So St. Mark xvi. 5. St. Matt. (xxviii. 2) says "the Angel of the Lord"; and St. Luke (xxiv. 4) speaks of two men standing in shining garments.

[3] St. Matt. xxviii. 5–7; St. Mark xvi. 6–7. St. Luke xxiv. 5–8 changes this message to a reference to Christ's prediction of His resurrection when He was yet in Galilee.

[4] St. Matt. xxviii. 9–10.

[5] St. Mark's unfinished closing passage (xvi. 8) says that they told nothing to any man because they were afraid. That they did tell some one is implied, however, in the fact that their experience is given in this Gospel. The meaning may be that they told no one *while going to the disciples*.

[6] St. Matt. xxviii. 8; St. Luke xxiv. 8–11. St. Matt. omits mention of disbelief.

[7] St. Matt. xxviii. 11–15.

[8] Cf. p. 202, and n. 1, below.

[9] St. John xx. 1–10.

and then Christ, at first mistaken for a gardener, appeared to her. She went and told the disciples;[1] 8. Christ appeared to two disciples walking to Emmaus late that afternoon, and talked with them. They did not recognize Him until He broke bread with them. They went back to Jerusalem with their news, and learned that Christ had appeared to Simon;[2] 9. Christ appeared that evening to ten Apostles at Jerusalem, when He said "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye behold Me having," and ate before them;[3] 10. He appeared to the eleven, and convinced Thomas by showing him His wounds. Thomas acknowledged Him in consequence as his Lord and God;[4] 11. He appeared to seven disciples and conversed with them by the sea of Tiberias;[5] 12. He appeared to the eleven in Galilee;[6] 13. He appeared finally to the Apostles, and ascended into a cloud in their sight near Jerusalem, forty days after His resurrection.[7]

[1] St. John xx. 11–18. Cf. S. Mark, app. xvi. 9–11. In St. Luke xxiv. 10, Mary Magdalene's experience seems to be merged in that of the other women.

[2] St. Luke xxiv. 13–35. Cf. St. Mark, app. xvi. 12.

[3] St. Luke xxiv. 36–43. Cf. St. John xx. 19–20, who does not mention the words quoted here, nor the eating, but says that the doors were shut when He appeared.

[4] St. John xx. 26–29. Cf. St. Mark, app. xvi. 14.

[5] St. John, app. xxi. 1–23.

[6] St. Matt. xxviii. 16–17. Perhaps this corresponds with the appearance to five hundred at once, 1 Cor. xv. 6.

[7] St. Luke xxiv. 50–51; St. Mark, app. xvi. 19. Cf. Acts i. 6–11, in which St. Luke mentions the forty days — not elsewhere given. On the appearances in general, see B. F. Westcott, *Revelation of*

§ 8. If we receive these testimonies as worthy of credit, we shall readily deduce from them the conclusion that, on the third day after our Lord's death and burial, something happened which enabled Him to appear alive in flesh and bones to His disciples, and which involved the disappearance of His body from the tomb. No tenable inference can be made except that which the Apostles adopted and proclaimed, that on the third day our Lord rose in flesh from the dead. Postponing for the present the discussion of objections to this testimony, we proceed to mention certain confirmatory considerations. They do not constitute evidence, but they rightly deepen the confidence with which Christians accept the evidence as sufficient.

The resurrection, as traditionally understood and described, fits in with other particulars of Christian belief concerning God, concerning His purpose in creation and redemption, concerning the world-movement as subserving this purpose, and concerning the present dispensation of saving grace. More than this, it throws a flood of light on all these things, and seems to afford the keystone to the arch of truth over which we travel to God.[1]

In particular, its bodily aspect interprets and thus justifies the creation of matter, the spiritual purpose

---

the Risen Lord; Henry Latham, chh. iv–xii; W. J. S. Simpson, *Resurrection and Modern Thought*, chh. vi–viii; H. B. Swete, *op. cit.;* E. Mangenot, *La Résurrection de Jesus*, Pt. II. ch. ii; Jas. Orr, pp. 86–92 and chh. v–vi.

[1] Cf. ch. viii. §§ 5–8, below.

of which has been delayed in fulfilment by the weakness of our spirits, induced by sin. It does this because it achieves the redemption of the body,[1] and therefore is the pledge that our mishandled flesh will at last be renovated, transfigured and equipped for its eternally destined service in glory.[2] It elevates the Manhood which the eternal Son assumed to the state which properly belongs to human nature when appropriated by Him, an exaltation which was delayed only in order that in the flesh He might experience our sorrows and redeem us by His death. And it completes the Redeemer's victory over death, a victory which was indispensable for the attainment of His purpose, but which would have been imperfect if the effects of death on the body had not been undone.[3]

It is also an indispensable introduction to the priesthood and saving work which our Lord's death had once for all made possible and consecrated. This is so because His priesthood, being designed for the benefit of creatures whose spiritual growth is conditioned by use of the flesh, depends for adaptation to our needs upon His continued possession of the fulness of our nature. And the fulness of His glorified Manhood connects redemption with the sacramental dispensation, in which saving grace is imparted to us as mediated through His flesh and blood. Even if this language is figurative, the figure

[1] Rom. viii. 23. [2] Cf. ch. vii. §§ 11–12, below.
[3] Cf. ch. iii. § 7, above.

is scriptural, and depends for suitableness upon the truth of its implied postulate, which is that the Bestower of sacramental grace possesses that on which we are in some sense to feed, if we would have life in ourselves.[1]

The belief in the resurrection is also justified by its observable effect upon the Apostles, who could hardly have exhibited the triumph of grace over weakness which they did display in their lives, if the belief upon which they ostensibly based their conduct was either insincere or the outcome of illusion. When we consider also that the doctrine of a bodily resurrection of the Lord has always been the nerve of the Christian propaganda, the supposition that this doctrine is not in accord with the event which it is declared to describe appears exceedingly unlikely. Such a supposition converts the success of Christianity into an enigma, of which no solution can be imagined which a believer in divine providence can accept.[2]

III. *Objections to the Evidence*

§ 9. The Gospel narratives, we have seen, agree in the vital particulars that the body of Christ disappeared from the grave early in the morning of the third day, and that He appeared alive in bodily

[1] St. John vi. 48–58. Cf. ch. x. §§ 4, 8, below. Also H. L. Goudge, in *Ch. Qly. Review*, Jan., 1914, art. II.

[2] See C. H. Robinson, *Studies in the Resurrection of Christ*, IV; Malcolm MacColl, *Christianity in Relation to Science and Morals*, pp. 207–214.

form on various subsequent occasions. But these narratives vary in details,[1] and it is objected that their variations destroy their evidential value. The time indications in certain cases are either too obscure to interpret with certainty or insusceptible of mutual reconciliation. The events of Easter morning, in particular, cannot be arranged in a harmony which can stand serious criticism; and the narrative of the third Gospel, if it stood alone, would lead us to suppose, it is said, that the ascension occurred on the day of the resurrection — a conclusion which is out of accord with several of the documents. Finally, according to certain of our witnesses, our Lord's post-resurrection appearances occurred chiefly, if not exclusively, in and near Jerusalem; but according to others, the Apostles did not see Him until, in obedience to His instructions, they had followed Him into Galilee.

The mutual inconsistencies of detail are found chiefly in the accounts of the events of Easter morning, and this is perfectly natural. The ultimate sources of information concerning these events were testimonies from women who told their story under the stress of very great excitement. Each woman undoubtedly spread her own version of what happened; and that the traditions thus created, and at

[1] The nature of these variations has been indicated in foot-notes in § 7, above. On how they are to be regarded, see W. Milligan, pp. 56–62; Chas. Harris, pp. 490–492; J. Kennedy, pp. 131–133; T. Christlieb, pp. 468–474; Jas. Orr, chh. v–vi.

last made use of by the Gospel writers, should vary in details was to be expected. But these variations are not greater than are often found in comparing sincere concurrent testimonies on the witness-stand. Amid them all there emerges a substantial agreement as to the really significant particulars of the empty tomb, of an angelic message that Christ had risen, and of the Lord having been seen alive. It is hypercritical to require more.

These considerations also go far to explain the obscurity which hangs over the precise sequence of events. And it is to be remembered that the Gospels were not written as contributions to historical science. They are Gospels, designed to serve as memorials for the edification of believers. If they had been composed for unbelievers, they would no doubt have been written differently; but even so, we should be foolish, if we expected to find in them the kind of documents that modern negative critics desiderate.

The statement that St. Luke makes the ascension to occur at the close of the day of the resurrection cannot be made good. The concluding part of his narrative bears all the marks of a rapid survey of events in and near Jerusalem, from which time indications are omitted.[1] If all the post-resurrection events there given had occurred within the same day, the ascension would have taken place long after dark — an absurdity.

[1] See W. J. S. Simpson, *Our Lord's Resurrection*, pp. 189–190; T. Christlieb, pp. 470–471; J. Kennedy, pp. 79–80.

§ 10. There remains to be considered the alleged mutual opposition of traditions as to the locality of our Lord's appearances to His disciples. It is maintained that the accounts given in the original Markan Gospel, and in St. Matthew, not only give no appearances in Jerusalem after that to the women on Easter morning, but plainly imply that the disciples saw the risen Lord only in Galilee. On the other hand, St. Luke and St. John describe several appearances in and near Jerusalem, and St. Luke, it is said, leaves no time for appearances in Galilee.[1]

That two mutually independent traditions, the Galilæan and Judæan, lie behind these variations is a credible supposition, we admit. The original existence of such traditions seems very likely, for the Galilæan believers outside the apostolic band may for some time have had no knowledge of the Jerusalem appearances, and the non-apostolic believers at Jerusalem may have been at first ignorant of the appearances in Galilee. In this case each tradition would quickly be crystalized on its own limited lines and, when reduced to writing, would seem to leave no place for the other. It is a reasonable hypothesis that each Gospel writer took over one or other of these traditions in its crystalized form; and that in the spirit of faithfulness to his source he preserved even those elements which implied ignorance of any

[1] This difficulty is ventilated by Stapfer, *Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ;* and discussed by E. H. Day, pp. 9–16; W. J. S. Simpson, *op. cit.*, ch. ii; T. J. Thorburn, ch. ix.

other appearances than those given in the particular tradition made use of. If so, we have here one of several indications of the care which the Gospel writers usually took to preserve in their integrity the earliest accounts of the events which they described.

It does not follow, however, that the substantial truth of one of these traditions involves a rejection of the other as unhistorical. At least it does not, unless the events alleged in one tradition are demonstrably inconsistent with those alleged in the other. Granting that St. Luke's report of the angelic message is inconsistent with that of the other documents, this is a minor detail which does not at all close the question as to whether the two traditions can be reconciled in their fundamental particulars. Unless we disregard St. Luke's known habit of assembling in one uninterrupted narrative, and without a hint of time intervals, events which belonged to separate times and occasions, we are free to accept his explicit testimony in the Acts, that forty days intervened between the resurrection and the ascension. This leaves over thirty days after the appearances in Jerusalem for the journey to Galilee and back to Jerusalem, and for the Galilæan appearances — an ample period of time for these events.

The possibility that both traditions are true is therefore evident. The only real problem that remains is this: How can we reconcile the message to the disciples to meet the Lord in Galilee, where it is implied that they would first see Him, with His sub-

sequently appearing to them in Jerusalem, without waiting for their obedience to His directions? Surely the problem is not difficult. We are told that the disciples were incredulous. It is clear that they could not be persuaded that the message from Christ was genuine, and that their Master would meet them alive in Galilee, until they had seen Him with their own eyes. Accordingly, the Lord condescended to their limitations, and convinced them by several appearances. Such an explanation is true to life; and it at once accounts for the Judæan appearances, and leaves sufficient time for those in Galilee.

§ 11. A very different objection is that the alleged appearances of our Lord were confined to His immediate followers, whose interest in the vindication of His mission which His resurrection would afford was very strong. If Christ really rose from the grave and desired to establish the fact of this resurrection, which we are told was the purpose of His appearances, He would naturally have shown Himself, it is urged, to the people at large and to the rulers. But according to the Gospels He carefully kept Himself out of sight of the crowd, and neglected the most obvious means of establishing His claims. The result is that we have no disinterested testimony to the facts upon the reality of which belief in the resurrection depends.[1]

[1] Discussed by B. F. Westcott, *Revel. of the Risen Lord*, pp. 10–12; W. Milligan, pp. 32–38; J. Kennedy, pp. 134–138; W. J. S. Simpson, *Resurrection and Modern Thought*, pp. 91–92.

If this objection is valid, it leads to one or other of two conclusions: either that the disciples gave mendacious testimony, or that the so called appearances were illusions — the vision theory. The former supposition is no longer seriously urged, because of its obvious inconsistency with the lofty characters of the Apostles, now generally acknowledged. As to the vision theory, reasons will be given in the next chapter for rejecting it as incredible. Both alternatives being rejected, therefore, we are led to the conviction that the objection upon which they are based is more specious than valid.

Its appearance of validity is due to the supposition that His showing Himself to His enemies would in His own judgment have convinced them, and would have been consistent with divine methods of self-revelation. Neither supposition can be established. The words which our Lord puts into the mouth of Abraham in the story of the rich man and Lazarus, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, if one rose from the dead," [1] clearly reveals His mind as to the utility of such a showing of Himself to His enemies as the objection under consideration looks to. Such a fact as the resurrection cannot by any manner of means be made apparent in its true nature and bearings except to those who are responding to the spiritual leading that has already been given them; and the evidence of the resurrection which has actually been afforded has repeatedly, and in every age, exhibited its suf-

[1] St. Luke xvi. 31.

ficiency for the persuasion of those who are spiritually susceptible to its appeal.

There is an element of reserve in divine revelation, which determines the method of divine self-manifestation, and which forbids the casting of pearls of spiritual truth before carnally minded swine. This explains why our Lord could walk freely and openly among His enemies so long as He wore the humble guise pertaining to earthly human life, but could not do so when His very appearance had become a challenge to spiritual discernment.

It is by no means certain that His enemies could have seen the Lord, even if they had been in the upper room with the disciples when He appeared to them. We have yet to discuss the change which His body had undergone, and content ourselves at this point with the suggestion that it had become invisible to earthly eyes, except when such vision was aided by His grace; and His enemies were not then receptive of such aid.

The conclusion of the matter is that the evidence of His resurrection which Jesus Christ afforded has proved sufficient for those who are open to persuasion as to its meaning, and could not from the nature of things have been adapted to really alien minds. We cannot hope to-day, therefore, to convince the unspiritual that the Lord rose in flesh from the dead; but we need not on this account suspect the sufficiency of the evidence that He did so.[1]

[1] The recipients of the resurrection-testimony are on trial, rather than apostolic witnesses.

§ 12. What has been said above, as to the unlikelihood that our Lord's body could have been seen without spiritual aid after its resurrection change, bears also on an objection based upon the difficulty with which His own disciples recognized Him. It is urged that this difficulty throws suspicion on the correctness of their impression that they saw Him, and not a mere vision, or even some one else. For example, if in spite of her previous intimacy with Christ the Magdalene could mistake Him for a gardener, is it not possible that her subsequent recognition of Him was equally at fault, the illusion being caused by some resemblance of voice and by the gardener happening to be one who knew her name? The two disciples who engaged in a long conversation with Christ, it is argued, must have been abnormally stupid to have failed to recognize Him until the moment of His disappearance, and such a disappearance as they are said to have witnessed cannot be explained by any known physical laws.[1]

This last statement is certainly true. Purely physical laws do not account for certain phenomena connected with our Lord's appearances; and the readiness of the disciples to report them, in spite of the doubts which were sure to be created in the minds of others by the presence of such inexplicable elements in their stories, points to the honesty of their testimony. The question at issue is the con-

[1] On the difficulty of recognition, see W. J. S. Simpson, *op. cit.*, pp. 85–89.

sistency of such abnormal phenomena with the interpretation put upon them by those who witnessed them. That is, did the Lord really appear in flesh?

In facing this question we must reckon with all parts of the Gospel testimonies. We have no right to discuss the abnormal elements without their context. Accordingly, if we accept the truthfulness of the witnesses when they tell of phenomena which transcend physical laws, we should do likewise when they describe the risen Christ as offering His body to be examined and touched, and as eating before them, in order to convince them that He had risen in real flesh and bones, recognizable as the same in which He was crucified. In brief, the testimony is equally positive as to two things: (*a*) that our Lord appeared alive in ways that showed His possession of real flesh; (*b*) that His flesh had undergone mysterious changes which revealed themselves in abnormal phenomena, not susceptible of explanation by physical laws. The question, we repeat, is, Can these two things be reconciled? From the standpoint of naturalism, and of its conception of world-history, they obviously cannot; and we do not cherish the delusion that those who occupy such a standpoint can be convinced, so long as they retain it, by any evidence which can be presented. But the difficulty lies with the standpoint, and with the purely speculative dogmatism which limits all possible phenomena to what is explainable by purely physical laws. That this dogmatism begs the question at issue is perfectly clear.

The fact of the resurrection and the Christian doctrine of it stand or fall together. That is, the conception of history which caused the fact in question to receive the interpretation which it has received in Christian doctrine, and which makes this doctrine credible, supplies a standpoint from which justice can be done both to the physical and to the supernatural aspects of our Lord's resurrection. It does more. It enables us to perceive not only that the resurrection has a place in the world-drama which is supremely fitting and illuminative of the whole, but also that the manner of its revelation to the disciples is in the truest harmony with the nature of the resurrection itself.

That event was no mere resuscitation of flesh, although the flesh was indeed raised from death. It was the exaltation of flesh to the state and power for which it was destined from the beginning — the earnest, the pledge and the enabling *prius* of what is to come. By the event of that Easter morn Jesus Christ became "the Firstfruits of them that are asleep." The credibility of such an event is of the highest, not less so because it cannot be established by the methods of an agnostic naturalism.

CHAPTER VII

RIVAL THEORIES AND DIFFICULTIES

I. *Theories*

§ 1. We now come to the theories by which rationalists have sought to explain away the evidence of the resurrection. And first of all we consider the *swoon theory*, originally adopted by Paulus and the older rationalists, refuted by Strauss, and after a period of neglect revived again in our day. According to this theory, our Lord did not really die, but went into a protracted swoon, from which He was revived by the combined effect of the cool air of the tomb and the aromatic spices employed in His burial. It is urged that crucifixion would not normally cause death so soon as is reported in His case, and that instances are known in which victims of crucifixion have been revived after supposed death.[1]

The answer is threefold. In the first place, the evidence of our Lord's death seemed sufficient to His

[1] Cf. ch. v. § 1, above. The swoon theory was advanced by Paulus, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, iii. It was urged by Thos. Huxley also. See *Christianity and Agnosticism*, pp. 76–80 (cf. pp. 147 ff.). It is criticised by T. Christlieb, pp. 455–457; E. H. Day, pp. 45–50; W. Milligan, pp. 76–80; T. J. Thorburn, pp. 183–185; W. J. S. Simpson, *op. cit.*, pp. 43–44.

watchful enemies, in spite of the quickness of it, and was made sure by the piercing of His side. The ensuing flow of blood and water from the wound is taken by medical authorities to prove death by broken heart.[1] It was not surprising that He died so soon, in view of His having been without food from the previous evening, and having undergone so much mental as well as physical suffering in the interval. We have to remember also that it was His will to die for mankind; so that the will to live, which explains the lingering quality of many deaths, was not operative in Him after He had finished drinking His appointed cup of pain.

In the second place, assuming for argument's sake that He did not die on the Cross, the supposition that He was sufficiently revived by the cool air and spices to roll away the stone and depart is highly incredible, in view of all He had suffered. The cases of recovery appealed to are explained by the careful nursing of friends, whereas He was left to Himself. Moreover, under the most favourable conditions, such recovery as was needed in His case before He could leave the tomb would require more time than was available — a scant forty hours — between His removal from the Cross and His disappearance from the tomb.

Finally, the events and appearances which followed His departure from the tomb cannot be explained by

[1] See Wm. Stroud, *Physical Cause of the Death of Christ;* R. W. Dale, *Atonement*, pp. 462–465 (note D); Alex. R. Simpson, in *Expositor*, Oct. 1911, art. II.

the swoon theory. His clothes were found in the tomb, lying in positions suggestive of His body having exhaled through them, as it were, a fact which appears to have convinced St. John of a miraculous resurrection.[1] The idea that one recovering from a deep swoon caused by protracted suffering and severe wounds could extricate Himself from His wrappings and, if He could, would wander forth naked, is not tenable. Then we find Him undertaking a considerable journey on foot to Emmaus, and appearing to His disciples the same evening in Jerusalem again. Those who saw Him on that day seemed to find evidences of supernatural power in His bearing and actions, rather than the ghastly state and weakness of one who had just emerged from a frightful swoon and who retained the limitations of mortality and corruptibility. Finally, we have the observed fact of His ascension. If the swoon theory were true, His final disappearance must have been very different — by natural death, either among His disciples or in some place of retirement.

It is clear that the Gospel narratives forbid the acceptance of the swoon theory, which can be made to seem credible only on the supposition that these narratives are false in fundamental particulars.

§ 2. We come to the *theft theory*, which, according to the first Gospel, was spread abroad by the soldiers at the bidding of the Jewish chief priests and elders.

[1] St. John xx. 6–8. Cf. H. Latham, chh. i–iii.

It is said that our Lord's body was stolen from the tomb by His disciples, while the soldiers slept.[1]

Even if we assume that the soldiers believed this, their own testimony shows that they did not see the disciples remove the body. Finding the tomb empty, they made the unsupported inference that the disciples were responsible for the disappearance. Against their inference we have the lofty character of the Apostles, who would have been incapable of basing their whole ministry on a lie. And the supposition that the moral and spiritual triumphs of Christianity are based upon falsehood is incredible.

The emptiness of the tomb has sometimes been explained by suggesting that the Jews removed the body. This supposition raises grave difficulties in the sphere of biblical criticism; but the conclusive answer to it is that, if it were true, the Jews would have produced the body as an effectual confutation of the apostolic assertion of the resurrection.[2] The supposition that Joseph of Arimathea removed it[3] does not challenge serious consideration. The same is to be said of the theory that the soldiers removed the body.[4] No adequate motive can be suggested.

[1] St. Matt. xxviii. 11–15. See E. H. Day, pp. 25–29; W. Milligan, pp. 80–81; T. J. Thorburn, pp. 191–199; W. J. S. Simpson, *Resurrection and Modern Thought*, pp. 40–43.

[2] See C. H. Robinson, *Studies in the Resurrection of Christ*, pp. 69–71.

[3] So Arnold Meyer, *Die Auferstehung Christi*, p. 118; and O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus*, according to W. J. S. Simpson, *op. cit.*, pp. 42–43.

[4] Offered by Mr. Rolleston, in *Hibbert Journal*, Apr., 1906.

Finally, there is the idea that the women came to the wrong tomb, and in their excitement misconstrued the young man's attempt to explain, "He is not here. . . . See the place where they laid Him," pointing to another tomb.[1] In suggesting this, Dr. Lake is obviously governed by a doctrinal preconception as to the non-physical nature of the resurrection. He does not pretend that his suggestion is supported by evidence, and it violates intrinsic probabilities. The women were not in a frame of mind to jump at the conclusion that Christ had risen from the dead, and would not have done so, if the message had not been too clear to be misunderstood. Moreover, we have to reckon with the subsequent finding of our Lord's clothes in the tomb.

§ 3. The theory that the appearances of our Lord represent so many *visions* conjured up by the highly wrought feelings of the disciples has been too thoroughly discussed in current literature to require more than the briefest attention here.[2] It is said to be supported by the fact that St. Paul coördinates the appearances before the ascension with his own experience on the road to Damascus; and this, it

[1] So Kirsopp Lake, *Hist. Evid. for the Resurrection*, pp. 246–253. Answered by W. J. S. Simpson, *op. cit.*, pp. 45–46; Jas. Orr, pp. 129–131.

[2] Discussed by T. Christlieb, pp. 457–503; C. A. Row, *Christian Evidences*, Lec. vii; W. Milligan, pp. 81–114; W. J. S. Simpson, *op. cit.*, pp. 100–115; E. H. Day, pp. 51–58; T. J. Thorburn, pp. 128–136, 185–188; Jas. Orr, pp. 219–226. This theory was supported by Strauss, Renan and Jas. Martineau.

is urged, was a vision.[1] The disciples are also said to have been influenced by their reading of Old Testament prophecy and by Christ's own prediction that He would rise again on the third day.[2]

The contention that St. Paul saw only a vision on his way to Damascus cannot be made good. He clearly distinguishes between this experience and certain other experiences which he recognizes to be visions, and of his competence to discriminate between visions and real appearances there can be no reasonable doubt. Moreover, the physical effect of the appearance, — blindness, — while explainable by his having actually seen the glory of the Lord, cannot be accounted for by a mere subjective vision. The supposition that the disciples could have been led to expect their Master's resurrection from the tomb by the study of Old Testament prophecy, before the established fact of this resurrection had given them the clue, is incredible in view of the mental revolution required for such insight under the then conditions of Jewish thought. Old Testament prophecy on this subject derives what clearness it now seems to some to have from its fulfilment,[3] and the

[1] Cf. ch. vi. § 5, *fin.*, above.

[2] Certainly in St. Mark viii. 31; ix. 9. 30–31; x. 32–34; and parallels. Other instances are disputed by modern critics. Cf. W. J. S. Simpson, *op. cit.*, ch. i.

[3] Neither the story of Jonah nor Hos. vi. 2, — "After two days He will revive us; In the third day He will raise us up, and we shall live in His sight" — would have been thus understood before the resurrection. Cf. W. J. S. Simpson, *op. cit.*, pp. 53–57.

disciples were not expecting the resurrection, the Gospels being witness.

The state of mind to which the Apostles were reduced by our Lord's crucifixion was not that which is productive of ready belief in resurrection appearances. They had not seriously considered Christ's own predictions of His resurrection because they were preoccupied with the difficulty of relating His death to the idea of the Messiah's triumph; and therefore they could see no way out from the despondency into which they were thrown by the crucifixion.[1] The obstinate incredulity with which they received the women's testimony is entirely inconsistent with susceptibility to visions of the Lord Himself. Then, too, they were hard-headed peasants, whose imaginations were limited to the normal events of natural experience.

Again, there is a particularity and coherence in the narratives of the appearances which is not to be found in accounts of visions. The touch, the eating and drinking, and the protracted conversations, all suggest objective appearances. Furthermore, visions are not normally experienced coincidently and on the same lines by gatherings of people. The appearance to five hundred at once stands wholly outside the known compass of visions. Finally, there is the definite cessation of the appearances at the end of forty days, with the withdrawal of Christ into Heaven. The appearance to St. Paul was as

[1] Cf. W. J. S. Simpson, *op. cit.*, pp. 8–11.

from Heaven, and constitutes an event which is entirely consistent with this final withdrawal from the world.

§ 4. The theory of Keim, that the appearances were *objective visions* "granted directly by God and by the glorified Christ," and designed to convince the disciples that their Master was living on in the spirit world, but not in their apparent materiality agreeing with the glorified Lord's actual state, is hopelessly discredited by the divine deceit which it involves.[1] Our Lord's appeal to His possession of flesh and bones was either based upon His then having the flesh in which He died, or was deceptive. It was calculated to persuade, and did persuade, the disciples that He had really risen in flesh from the tomb; and the faith of the Church from that day to this is grounded in the assertion that such a resurrection took place. If Keim is right, the basis of the Church's faith and triumphs is a blunder, and one of divine causation.

Surely, if God's purpose was to convince the disciples that their Master lived on in a non-bodily state, a more illuminating and less misleading method of revealing this could have been

[1] See W. J. S. Simpson, *op. cit.*, pp. 115–122; E. D. la Touche, *Person of Christ*, pp. 314, 321–323; W. Milligan, pp. 114–119; E. H. Day, pp. 44–45; T. J. Thorburn, pp. 136–140, 189–191; Jas. Orr, pp. 226–231. The theory is supported in modified form by B. H. Streeter, *Foundations*, pp. 127–141; and K. Lake, *Hist. Evid. for the Resurrection*, pp. 270–272. Other refs. to its supporters are given by Simpson, p. 115.

employed.[1] Moreover, the empty grave has to be accounted for; and no credible explanation of it has been given except the apostolic doctrine of our Lord's resurrection in flesh on the third day.

II. *Some Difficulties*

§ 5. Natural science is supposed by many to have established the impossibility of renewal of life in a human body after it has once been extinguished by death. This supposition, however, is based upon misapprehension. Natural science is not concerned with defining possibilities, but with describing the phenomena of normal experience — such phenomena, that is, as can be generalized in terms of natural law. And a natural law is merely a description of how things are observed to happen under the operation of given natural factors and conditions.

[1] Sir Oliver Lodge, in his *Raymond*, F. W. H. Myers, in *Personality*, and others regard the phenomena of spiritism as proofs of survival after death. Cf. W. J. S. Simpson, *op. cit.*, ch. xxxi; Jas. Orr, pp. 28–30. The subject cannot be discussed here, except to say that mere personal survival falls far short of the requirements of Christian immortality. Attempts have also been made to interpret the resurrection appearances as spiritistic manifestations. But such phantom-like appearances neither agree with the Gospel narratives nor are of the kind which can explain the wonderful change in apostolic minds and characters of which the New Testament gives evidence. See T. J. Thorburn, pp. 188–189, who refers to Dr. Crowell's *Primitive Christianity and Modern Spiritualism.* For the spiritistic point of view, see E. M. Duff and T. G. Allen, *Psychic Research and Gospel Miracles*, esp. pp. 280–289. Cf. also C. H. Robinson, *Studies in the Resurrection*, VIII.

Whether or no these factors and conditions make up the sum total of possible determinants of events in the physical sphere under consideration, is a question which cannot be answered by natural science; for its self-chosen function is simply to give a generalized description of observed natural tendencies.

If the accepted scientific postulate is valid, that the same unhindered causes always produce the same effects, natural science can indeed say this much, that the renewal of the life of a human body after death does not happen under the causal conditions, exclusively considered, with which its generalizations are concerned. In brief, it can say that such an event as our Lord's resurrection in flesh cannot be accounted for by normal or natural causes. In other words, it constitutes a miracle, or an event the cause of which transcends the physical factors which natural science can scrutinize and describe. This witness of science supplements in a valuable way the evidence for the fact of the resurrection. It does so because it supports the apostolic teaching that the event in question was due to divine intervention, and therefore has a unique spiritual significance for human history.

The denial that the resurrection could have happened, as elsewhere shown in these pages, is not scientific, but has its source in the *à priori* and speculative philosophy called naturalism.[1] And such plausibility as the denial seems to have is derived

[1] In ch. vi. § 1.

employed.[1] Moreover, the empty grave has to be accounted for; and no credible explanation of it has been given except the apostolic doctrine of our Lord's resurrection in flesh on the third day.

II. *Some Difficulties*

§ 5. Natural science is supposed by many to have established the impossibility of renewal of life in a human body after it has once been extinguished by death. This supposition, however, is based upon misapprehension. Natural science is not concerned with defining possibilities, but with describing the phenomena of normal experience — such phenomena, that is, as can be generalized in terms of natural law. And a natural law is merely a description of how things are observed to happen under the operation of given natural factors and conditions.

[1] Sir Oliver Lodge, in his *Raymond*, F. W. H. Myers, in *Personality*, and others regard the phenomena of spiritism as proofs of survival after death. Cf. W. J. S. Simpson, *op. cit.*, ch. xxxi; Jas. Orr, pp. 28–30. The subject cannot be discussed here, except to say that mere personal survival falls far short of the requirements of Christian immortality. Attempts have also been made to interpret the resurrection appearances as spiritistic manifestations. But such phantom-like appearances neither agree with the Gospel narratives nor are of the kind which can explain the wonderful change in apostolic minds and characters of which the New Testament gives evidence. See T. J. Thorburn, pp. 188–189, who refers to Dr. Crowell's *Primitive Christianity and Modern Spiritualism*. For the spiritistic point of view, see E. M. Duff and T. G. Allen, *Psychic Research and Gospel Miracles*, esp. pp. 280–289. Cf. also C. H. Robinson, *Studies in the Resurrection*, VIII.

Whether or no these factors and conditions make up the sum total of possible determinants of events in the physical sphere under consideration, is a question which cannot be answered by natural science; for its self-chosen function is simply to give a generalized description of observed natural tendencies.

If the accepted scientific postulate is valid, that the same unhindered causes always produce the same effects, natural science can indeed say this much, that the renewal of the life of a human body after death does not happen under the causal conditions, exclusively considered, with which its generalizations are concerned. In brief, it can say that such an event as our Lord's resurrection in flesh cannot be accounted for by normal or natural causes. In other words, it constitutes a miracle, or an event the cause of which transcends the physical factors which natural science can scrutinize and describe. This witness of science supplements in a valuable way the evidence for the fact of the resurrection. It does so because it supports the apostolic teaching that the event in question was due to divine intervention, and therefore has a unique spiritual significance for human history.

The denial that the resurrection could have happened, as elsewhere shown in these pages, is not scientific, but has its source in the *à priori* and speculative philosophy called naturalism.[1] And such plausibility as the denial seems to have is derived

[1] In ch. vi. § 1.

solid in liquid and gaseous states. And every time a chemist combines two so called solids of different kinds so as to produce a new substance he causes them to penetrate each other. Whatever may be the truth of the contention that the ultimate constituents of matter are impenetrable — a question to be dealt with soon — so far from visible bodies like human flesh, wooden doors and stone walls being essentially impenetrable, even human power is equal to the task of manipulating them into mutually penetrable states. And nature is doing the same thing whenever the corpuscles thrown off by radio-active substances penetrate the solid (?) bodies with which they seem to collide.

It will perhaps be urged that to change the state and form of two bodies and then to bring about mutual penetration is one thing, whereas to cause one body to pass through another without altering the form and constitution of either is another and more difficult thing.[1] So far as our power is concerned this is undoubtedly so; but when once it is acknowledged that visible bodies are not really solid, and that under observable conditions they become mutually penetrable, we can no longer urge the impenetrability of matter as a reason for saying that the Lord of matter could not carry human flesh through closed doors.

[1] It should be remembered that our Lord's body had been changed, although not necessarily in the manner meant in the argument under consideration.

If the resurrection narrative is true, our Lord's entrance into the closed room was the passage of one system of eddying particles through another system of the same kind. It was the writer's privilege some years ago to see two military companies march through each other at right angles, without disturbance of ranks in either company. This was made possible by masterly control of soldierly movements. There was no collision, and no mutual penetration of solids. Could not God, if there were sufficient reason, in the exercise of His all-sovereign control, cause one planetary system to pass through another without confusing either system? If so, why could He not for sufficient reason cause two systems of atoms, such as a human body and a closed door, to pass through each other? He is central to every atom, and all motion is caused and controlled by Him. The miracle in question, therefore, lies within the compass of His power; and sufficient reason alone is needed to make its occurrence credible.

The question remains as to whether the ultimate constituents of matter are essentially impenetrable. If they are so, this is either because they are really solid substances or because, like points, they have no dimensions within which penetration could be achieved. If the latter hypothesis be adopted, are we not reducing matter to spirit? Is a body without dimensions material? Furthermore, are not both penetrability and impenetrability as inapplicable to such a substance as large and small are to spirit?

The former hypothesis would seem to be the only reasonable one, but it is made doubtful by recent investigations and speculations connected with radioactive substances. Whether the ultimate constituents of matter are solids, or mere strains in æther, is now a problem. If they are the latter, they may be mutually penetrable in a manner analogous to the mutual pentration of crossing waves at sea — an event which leaves each sea distinct.[1]

These considerations are not advanced as an attempt to define how our Lord could bring a real human body into a closed room. Of this we are ignorant. Our purpose is to show how unwarranted are the assertions concerning the intractibility and impenetrability of material bodies upon which disbelief in the physical resurrection of Christ is often based. And what we have shown in this section has important bearing on the question of the fitness of a material body for our personal functioning and self-expression in the life of the world to come.[2]

§ 7. St. Luke testifies that our Lord ate before His disciples after the resurrection, and reports St. Peter as saying in his sermon before Cornelius that our Lord's disciples "did eat and drink with

[1] See J. Orr, pp. 197–202, who refers to Stallo, *Concepts of Modern Physics*, pp. 91–92, 178–182. On recent investigations into the constitution of matter, see *Creation and Man*, pp. 91–94; R. K. Duncan, *The New Knowledge;* W. C. D. Whetham, *Recent development of Phys. Science*, ch. vii.

[2] Considered in §§ 11–12 of this chapter.

Him after He rose from the dead." [1] It is objected that such an action would be incongruous with the incorruptible and immortal state into which our Lord is supposed to have entered, a state in which material sustenance would be unnecessary, and in which there would no longer be any place for nutritive functioning. The inference is made that either St. Luke's record is erroneous or the eating was an objective vision, such as is hypothecated by Keim in his theory of the post-resurrection appearances in general.

The impossibility of accepting Keim's theory without ascribing deceit to the Lord of truth — an incredible hypothesis — has already been shown; [2] and the trustworthiness of St. Luke's narratives in general is now well established.[3] Only an *à priori* standpoint which begs the question can afford even a show of excuse for rejecting the part of his testimony which is under consideration.

That our Lord was no longer dependent upon physical nourishment certainly appears to be true; and the purpose of His eating was undoubtedly evidential. But what He sought to prove was expressed in His words, "It is I Myself: handle Me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye behold Me having." [4] In brief, He offered the

[1] St. Luke xxiv. 41–43; Acts x. 41. [2] In § 4 of this chapter.

[3] W. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller; Was Christ Born in Bethlehem? Cath. Encyc., s. v.* "Luke," VI; Hastings, *Dic. of Bible, s. v.* "Acts of the Apostles," ix; R. J. Knowling, *Acts* (Expositor's Greek Test.).

[4] St. Luke xxiv. 39.

reality of His flesh, shown by appeal to their senses and by His eating, as evidence that their crucified Master was alive before them. If what was shown was either an unreal phantom, or not truly His own flesh, — not the flesh by which they had been accustomed to identify Him, — Christ could not have acted sincerely in offering it as proof of His identity and of His resurrection from the tomb. It is clearly illogical for one who accepts the Gospel narrative to infer that, because our Lord's body had become independent of physical nourishment, it had also become incapable of receiving material food when its Owner so willed.

Our knowledge of resurrection life, and of the functions of the glorified body therein, is too slight for us to dogmatize as to the part which our bodily organs may or may not be able to fulfil in the world to come. The fact that the resurrection body is incorruptible seems to point to some changes in organic functioning, but that these changes involve absolute atrophy, and the loss of previous bodily organs, we have no warrant for asserting. It is possible, so far as anything can be advanced to the contrary, that our bodily organisms have been developed by God with as much reference to heavenly functions as to earthly ones. To suggest one among other possibilities in this direction, so far as we know, the mutual recognition of human spirits is invariably conditioned by their bodily frames; and no reason, other than an unwarranted denial of the

fitness of matter for spiritual use, can be given for supposing that this law will not hold good hereafter. But if the bodily frame needs to be retained in the future world, its organized parts appear also to have abiding value. An entire atrophy of bodily organs seems to be inconsistent with maintenance of a recognizable bodily frame.

Our argument does not, however, depend upon speculative conjectures as to the way in which our bodies may be useful to us hereafter. What we are maintaining is this. The frequent assertion that our bodily organism is unsuited to the changed conditions of heavenly life, and therefore not divinely intended to have part therein, is based, so far as there is any other basis than *à priori* dogmatism, upon a precarious and unverified inference from the limitations which attend, and are appropriate to, this earthly and transitional stage in the development of human nature. As against the positive evidence that Christ revealed Himself as "having" flesh and bones after His resurrection, such an inference should be rejected by all who seriously accept the resurrection narratives.

§ 8. The problem of our Lord's post-resurrection clothing has been handled by certain writers as if its solution involved inferences contrary to our Lord's possession of His crucified flesh after the resurrection.[1] According to the Gospel evidence, the

[1] *E.g.* Robert Vaughan, in *Church Quarterly Review*, Jan., 1916, pp. 352 *et seq.*

clothes in which the body of Christ was buried were left in the tomb by Him. That He appeared to have clothing after the resurrection will be disputed by no one. Whence, then, did He obtain this clothing? And was it a real and abiding apparel, or was it a passing projection from His Person, an objective vision, appropriate in each several case to the particular circumstances of His self-manifestation?

The latter supposition has been ventilated, and made the basis of the conjecture that Christ appeared to Mary Magdalene as wearing a gardener's apparel, and to others under changed circumstances as differently clothed. The general conclusion has been adopted that the appearances, both of His body and of His clothing, were economic, having evidential purpose only. The reality was in the manifestation, apart from which Christ was invisible spirit. And this conclusion is thought to be supported by the difficulty with which the disciples recognized their risen Master — as if, for example, the form of manifestation to the disciples on the road to Emmaus was different from that in which they finally recognized Him. The proposition is laid down that our Lord possessed no static form,[1] but that His self-visualization in external form was a passing act of His Person.

This position has been maintained in a reverent spirit, and with commendable desire to avoid mate-

[1] *E.g.* by B. F. Westcott, in *Gospel of the Resurrection*, pp. 144-146.

rialistic conceptions. But it is not essentially different from Keim's objective vision theory,[1] and its logic is not less fatal in the end to reverence for the character of the risen Lord because of the spirit and motive with which it has been set forth. Our Lord appeared to His disciples in a manner calculated to persuade them that He possessed real flesh, the flesh in which He was crucified, although manifestly changed so as to be brought into entire subjection to His spirit. His body had also disappeared from the tomb. And he confirmed the impression which such a mode of self-manifestation, and the emptiness of the tomb, were likely to produce by expressly emphasizing the reality of His flesh and of the scars which His wounds had left in it. On the assurance of a physical resurrection thus inevitably created the Church has ever since grounded her faith. Surely the Lord foresaw this result; and if the impression which determined the Apostles' faith was mistaken, He wittingly caused the mistake. In plain terms, He deceived them — an impossible supposition for those who believe in His Person.

The difficulty of recognition was not due to a dematerialization of His body, but to its glorification and to the subjection of its conditions of visibility to His masterful will. This sovereignty over the flesh is one in which our own glorified spirits are destined to have subordinate share. Under its glorified or pneumatical conditions, flesh is not

[1] Discussed in § 4 of this chapter.

normally visible to those who are still subject to earthly limitations of vision; but the Lord of glory was able to overcome this difficulty in the case of His spiritually trained disciples. The appearances, in brief, were miraculous manifestations of transfigured flesh to those who were still limited by the laws of earthly vision. But they were real manifestations of real flesh, if the testimony of the Lord Himself is to be accepted.

The problem of His clothes is a curious question, which need not trouble us. Whether He created new clothing, borrowed it, or even caused an objective vision of clothing, is not vital to determine. Either supposition might be true. But in neither case could the element of deception enter; for the subject-matter of His manifestation was not clothing but His risen body, the fleshly nature and identity of which was explicitly set forth by Him as evidence for the belief which He aimed to establish. And this belief was not that He had survived death in the realm of spirit, but that He had conquered death by reanimating His flesh and by exalting it to conditions appropriate to His possession and subsequent use of it.

III. *Flesh and Spirit*

§ 9. The rest of the chapter will be devoted to the general problem of the fitness of flesh for the future life and functioning of human spirits in glory. The relevance of such a discussion to the subject

arises from the fact that, apart from certain unique aspects of His resurrection, He has thereby become "The Firstfruits of them that are asleep." It is obvious that our ideas of the possibilities of our own future life will have determinative influence upon our interpretation of our Lord's self-manifestation after His resurrection. Two obstacles to this discussion have to be faced and removed, however, before its data can be correctly interpreted.

The first of these is the oft-repeated assertion that belief in our possession of real flesh hereafter is materialistic. It is made in some cases by writers who are too lofty minded to be guilty of intentional resort to an appeal to popular prejudice. But more frequently it represents an *argumentum ad invidiam;* and the assertion is almost invariably made without sufficient examination of its grounds and implications. Materialism has for its definitive mark a denial of the reality and function of spirit, and the assertion that all things and events are aspects and manifestations of matter and motion. The term "materialistic" is also extended in application to describe any philosophy, opinion or working principle of conduct which either excludes spiritual realities and factors or in logical effect dethrones the spiritual from the determinative place and function which it ought to have in the universe and in human life.

Presumably the contention that belief in our recovery and use of flesh in the world to come is mate-

rialistic rests upon the supposition that such a belief, if true, enthrones matter in the place which should be occupied by spirit — at least reduces that triumph of spirit, the expectation of which gives Christians their courage to bear the sufferings and limitations of this life. No Christian believer infers from the indisputable fact that our spirits now exist in the flesh, and that their personal functioning and self-expression is organically conditioned, that therefore the doctrine of creation and providence by which these conditions are theologically accounted for is materialistic. Even the observed subservience of human spirits to the flesh does not lead us to such a conclusion.

What saves us from being thus misled is the generally available and sufficient evidence that, even in this stage of the world-drama, the true purpose of things in general, and the trend of events as a whole, is spiritual. We are learning more conclusively every day that matter and material forces are created for the use of spirit, and are, in fact, spiritually useful when rightly regarded and employed.[1] Man's progress lies in learning how to use matter for the purposes of spirit, and in practising the art of such use with divine assistance and holy self-discipline. The spiritual nature of Christianity lies neither in the elimination of the material and external nor in an asceticism which treats the flesh as

[1] *Creation and Man*, pp. 83–84; J. R. Illingworth, *Divine Immanence*, ch. i.

evil *in se*, but in the progress which it makes possible in utilizing the flesh and all material things and forces for spiritual ends.

These things being so, and spiritual interests being fostered by our divinely intended and assisted subjection of matter and flesh to the spirit, we may not consider belief in the personal union of flesh and spirit hereafter to be materialistic. We may not do so, unless it can be shown that the subjection of flesh to the spirit in a personal life determined and controlled by the spirit is merely a passing ideal, the continuance of which in the world to come would mean the triumph of flesh instead of the sovereignty of spirit. This has never been shown. In fact, the need of showing it is usually overlooked by those who describe the traditional Christian doctrine of *resurrectio carnis* as materialistic. We are justified in adding that the accusation of materialistic conceptions is more applicable to those who ascribe to the flesh an intractible might that precludes the completion under higher conditions of that subjection of it to the spirit to which creation points and which Christians are learning even in this world partly to achieve.

According to Christian doctrine, we are now fitting ourselves for a life in which the redemption of the body, and its endowment with incorruption and glory, will make possible our perfect spiritual utilization of the flesh for personal ends. It is true that we cannot adequately imagine the manner in which

glorified spirits will employ the flesh in the world to come; but, as we shall try to show, we have sufficient indications that the tie which unites flesh and spirit in personal functioning is neither anti-spiritual in itself nor of merely passing purpose and value.

§ 10. The second obstacle to a correct interpretation of the appearances of our Lord's risen body is the supposition that St. Paul excludes flesh from having part in the resurrection. That this supposition is erroneous has been shown in the previous chapter.[1] And we are inclined to think that the notion which we have just been combating — that the doctrine of a resurrection of real flesh is materialistic — largely explains the readiness of certain writers who have no sympathy with rationalistic criticism to ascribe a contrary view to St. Paul. We venture to give again the determinative elements of his argument, so far as germane to the question before us.

These elements are three. (*a*) The first is his distinction between the body as we now have it, *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, and the body as it will be in glory, *σῶμα πνευματικόν*. There is no suggestion in this contrast of a difference in the substantial nature of the body in the two states compared, but only of a change from the psychic state of control of the body by the animal soul to the pneumatic state of its control by the higher *pneuma* or spirit. The

[1] Ch. vi. §§ 5–6, where the needed references can be found.

question of the substantial nature or content of the psychic and of the pneumatic body is not determined. It is not even raised.

(*b*) The second determinative element is his statement that "flesh and blood, σὰρξ καί αἷμα, cannot, οὐ δύνανται, inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." It has been contended with some show of reason that "flesh and blood" here means man in his native capacity, apart from divine intervention, and that St. Paul is merely punctuating the truth that our inheritance of the kingdom is made possible only by divine action. We do not base our argument, however, upon this exegesis. We are content to suppose that by "flesh and blood" St. Paul means our physical and corruptible organism. The thought of St. Paul will then be that it is not within the power which the physical organism here naturally possesses to inherit the kingdom, and corruption has not of itself power to inherit incorruption. If St. Paul stopped at this point, the natural inference would be that in his view death will forever end the union between our flesh and our spirit.

(*c*) But there is a third element in his argument which forbids such an inference. Having declared the inability of flesh and corruption to raise themselves to the incorruptible state which is enjoyed in the future kingdom of God, he goes on to declare that what corruption cannot do, God will accomplish by the change which He is to bring about at the last

trump. In spite of its native incapacity, "this corruptible must put on incorruption," etc.; and it is by the divinely wrought change of corruptible flesh into incorruption that the victory over death through Jesus Christ is obtained. In brief, that flesh which cannot of itself inherit what is in store for the faithful is said to be the subject-matter of a mysterious change, in which the power of God in Jesus Christ will make good the native incapacity of this corruptible.

As thus analyzed, the argument of St. Paul is self-consistent. Moreover, it contains neither a denial that the flesh will be raised and inherit the kingdom, nor any approach to the implication that the conditions and functions of our glorified spirits will be hampered by renewed possession of flesh in the resurrection life. What is emphasized is that this renewal will be conditioned by a change from a psychic to a pneumatic state, from corruptibility to incorruptibility, and that the change will be caused by a higher power than is possessed by flesh and blood, as now constituted. The whole bundle of inferences and arguments by which St. Paul's teaching is so interpreted as to reduce the significance of the Gospel evidence that our Lord retained true flesh in the resurrection state should be abandoned. In any case, to quote a recent writer, "If, which I do not think is the case, the Epistles of St. Paul and the stories of the appearances of the Gospels present us with two views of the nature of the Risen

Body, of which with our present knowledge, we are not able to conceive a reconciliation, it is *not* a reasonable escape from the difficulty to explain away the testimony of writers, whose testimony, apart from this difficulty, we should accept as trustworthy and true." [1]

§ 11. We now come to the subject to which the last two sections have been introductory, or the functional relation of flesh to our spirits in this life and in the life to come.[2] That in this life flesh is necessary and useful for our spiritual and personal functioning and growth, and that its value for personal purposes increases in proportion to our spiritual development, is proved by the facts of the every-day experience and observation of all men.

That flesh is both necessary and useful to human spirits is an obvious inference from the fact that human nature as it has been constituted by God is made up of flesh and spirit. And their union is so vital that when it is disturbed the man is ill, and when it is entirely broken the man dies. Certain disorders of fleshly functions invariably interfere with our spiritual functions, which, so far as we can discover, are never exercised except in dependence upon conditions afforded by the fleshly organism.

[1] Wilfrid Richmond, a paper, *The Risen Body*, p. 15.

[2] The subject has not been adequately considered; but for contributory matter, see W. J. S. Simpson, *Resurrection and Modern Thought*, chh. xxiv–xxix; S. C. Gayford, *Future State*, pp. 78–87; Hastings, *Dic. of Christ*, *s. v.* "Resurrection of the Dead," p. 516, 2d col.; E. D. la Touche, *Person of Christ*, pp. 321–323.

Significant examples of this dependence are abundant. The acquisition of knowledge is always based upon experience, in which physical functioning invariably provides the occasions and conditions of cognition. Human knowledge and human thoughts are in every case conveyed to others and received from them by methods which enlist the use of physical movements and material *media*. Even the function of thinking is impossible without exercise of the gray matter of the brain, and the same condition attends the mental assimilation of thought received from others. The mysteries of telepathy cannot be actualized independently of pathological states.[1] An exclusive functioning of human spirits, independently of the physical organism, has never been observed.[2]

The fleshly organism is not only an indispensable handmaid of spirit, but it is an increasingly useful one. The whole process of education can be described as development in the use of flesh by its inhabiting spirit. Each element of an individual's advancement in mental and spiritual efficiency is a step in fuller knowledge, and more masterful enlistment and control, of the bodily frame and functions for the development of personal life and self-expression. In the higher reaches of spiritual

[1] On telepathy, see Baldwin, *Dic. of Philos.*, *q. v.*

[2] The late Bishop B. F. Westcott, from whose view of the resurrection we differ in some respects, realized that a disembodied human soul is hardly to be reckoned as personal. See *Gospel of the Resurrection*, pp. 146–156, 179–182. Cf. C. F. D'Arcy, *Christianity and the Supernatural*, ch. viii.

growth the mastery of the flesh by holy discipline, as distinguished from its disparagement, is a law by the observance of which personality is more abundantly actualized and perfected. In brief, the triumph of spirit does not lie in an atrophy of flesh, but in the enlistment of its powers for what appears to be their divinely intended purpose of spiritual service. To deny the fitness of flesh for such service is to impugn the wisdom and power of its Creator, and utterly to misread the long story of human development.

That the employment of flesh by the human spirit has been attended by difficulties, and that "the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit,"[1] is not to be explained by an intrinsic antagonism between flesh and spirit, but by the sinful limitations of our spirits,[2] the remedy for which has been afforded by redeeming grace. That we have to *learn how* to use the flesh for spiritual ends, and that self-disciplinary practice is essential to this learning, illustrates the educational and preparatory meaning of this earthly life, rather than the transitory nature of the spiritual use of flesh for which it educates us. Why are we trained until death in the use of flesh, if we are hereafter to be independent of such use? And is such independence suggested by any facts known to us? The most pertinent fact, other than the resurrection of our Lord, seems to be the

[1] Gal. v. 17. Cf. 1 St. Pet. ii. 11; St. Matt. xxvi. 41.

[2] St. Jas. iv. 5; Eph. iv. 23; 2 Pet. ii. 14. The growth of saint-hood requires a waxing strong in spirit. Cf. St. Luke i. 80.

reduction of spiritual functioning which invariably attends the decay of our bodily organs. If death were to bring a permanent loss of the flesh, it would seem that the spirit would have to begin *de novo*, and learn how to function without the flesh.

The conclusion to which we are driven can be well expressed in Dr. Moberly's language:[1] The individual man "is obviously bodily, he is transcendently spiritual. His bodily life is no mere type, or representation of his spiritual; it *is* spiritual life, expanding, controlling, developing under bodily conditions. The real meaning of the bodily life is its spiritual meaning. The bodily is spiritual. And, conversely, the spiritual is bodily. Even when he is recognized as essentially spiritual, yet his spiritual being has no avenue, no expression, no method, other than the bodily; insomuch that, if he is not spiritual in and through the bodily, he cannot be spiritual at all."

§ 12. The only human body we know anything about is constituted by flesh. Its resurrection without flesh is unimaginable; and the distinction often made in this connection between an ethereal body and one containing flesh has no warrant either in our knowledge of the body or in revelation.[2] Our

[1] *Ministerial Priesthood*, pp. 39–40. Cf. his *Problems and Principles*, p. 358.

[2] We do not deny that σάρξ is often used in a way to connote an unregenerate state of the body (*e.g.* in Rom. vii. 5); but it is never used in the New Testament in such wise as to distinguish fleshly *substance* from the substance of the resurrection body.

Lord is described in the Gospels as appearing after His resurrection in real flesh; and a denial of the part of flesh in the future life is inevitably determined in the meaning which it conveys by the analogies of our available knowledge of the body — a repudiation of New Testament doctrine. If the flesh, then, is to rise, what functions can it fulfil for spirit in the future life? Our answer to this question must be inadequate and to a degree conjectural. Yet our assurance that the flesh will be useful to us hereafter is not without reasonable support.

Our bodily organisms have two groups of functions, concerned respectively with their self-maintenance and with their employment by our spirits — this last being the purpose of their creation. The transition from corruptibility to incorruptibility for which Christians look perfects the body for spiritual use, but seems to involve some modification of those functions that have to do with the body's self-maintenance. When we infer, however, that certain organs of the body will become useless, we fall in two respects into unwarranted dogmatism.

In the first place, we have no means of knowing that bodily immortality entirely nullifies the laws of bodily maintenance. The glorification of the body is not its subversion. If the resurrection body is material in any proper sense, this seems to point to some bodily functioning by which its life shall be maintained and its substantial form and content

preserved. The body's putting on incorruption and immortality cannot be shown to mean a mere induration and inorganic crystallization. The line of thought which we are hinting at cannot be carried far in our present state of knowledge, and to many it will seem to be too remote for consideration. So far as we know, it has never been seriously reckoned with. But the point here made is that, if we cannot describe beforehand how the body will be enabled to maintain itself against corruption and mortality in the world to come, neither can we show that the organs of the body which now have to do with its maintenance of life will cease to be utilized in any manner whatever. The permanent triumph of life over mortality in the body no doubt signifies the abiding victory of spirit in its animation of the flesh; but it need not mean an absolute abolition of the laws which our spirits are seen to obey in animating it. Grace does not subvert nature, but perfects it. Bodily immortality would seem to be an immortality the manner of which is determined by the laws of bodily continuance — gloriously developed and modified, no doubt, but not really reversed.

The second form of unwarranted dogmatism, which a denial of the future utility of certain organs of the body involves, is the assumption that these organs have no other functions which justify their continuance except those of bodily nourishment. As has been already indicated, they constitute a

part of the bodily frame; and this frame, apart from the functions of locomotion, of the hands and arms and of the senses, is closely connected with mutual recognition and physical beauty. Mutual recognition, in particular, is clearly a condition of the enjoyment of the life to come; and no other manner of it is known to us except that which the human frame makes possible. These considerations do not of themselves prove that our bodily organs have been constituted beforehand so as to be useful both in this life and in the life to come; but they illustrate the impossibility of proving that these organs must cease to be useful hereafter. If their use is modified, the modification does not require, perhaps does not permit, any radical alteration of their form.

We have seen that in this life our fleshly bodies supply the necessary conditions of personal self-expression and mutual communication. No exceptions to this law have ever been observed, and no warrant can be given for the supposition that it will be abolished in the resurrection life. The argument has been pressed, however, that the personal functions of this kind to which our bodies minister are pitifully imperfect, and that flesh is necessarily unsuited for the perfect intercommunion of glorified spirits in the world to come.[1]

[1] *E.g.* by W. J. S. Simpson, *Our Lord's Resurrection*, ch. viii; and *Resurrection and Modern Thought*, pp. 411–415. He acknowledges that the resurrection body is material, but denies the resurrection of our existing fleshly organism.

Such an assertion requires for its justification a more adequate knowledge of the nature and possibilities of matter and of the human body than is available. It is a patent fact that, even under the probationary limitations of earthly life, the value of the flesh for personal self-expression and intercommunion continually increases. And this increase is especially marked under the conditions of spiritual discipline — that is, of practice by the spirit in controlling the flesh. This control is never fully perfected in this world, but the reason lies partly in the fact that our spirits do not reach their full development and power on this side of the grave, and partly in the necessity that this corruptible shall put on incorruption. It is a fact, none the less, that as between saintly spirits, the flesh becomes an increasingly facile instrument of personal fellowship.

The personal expression and intercommunion to which Christians look is a mutual experience, and this is reduced by spiritual imperfections on either side. Its possibilities when these imperfections disappear on both sides must exceed anything that we can imagine under the hampering conditions of our present incomplete development and of the as yet imperfectly subdued passions of our state of sin and bodily corruption. The saints in glory are conformed to the pattern of Jesus Christ, and possess common elements of personal character which make them to a degree reflections of each other. To the degree that they have learned to know themselves, to that

degree they have learned to understand each other. And the art of mutual recognition and communion through the body, partially mastered in this world, will have been practised and developed to a degree quite beyond our present experience. It will have been developed under the combined conditions of release from earthly distractions, of perfect mutual congeniality of character and of wondrously enlarged experience. *This world is as truly a realm of spirits as is the future world;* but in the future world our spirits will have obtained more perfect control of their bodies.

The ideas which grow out of stress on the so-called solidity and intractibility of flesh in this earthly life will surely lead us astray in this subject, if we are controlled by them. And the clear witness of the Gospels that Christ manifested Himself after His resurrection as possessed of flesh and bones should control our interpretation of the precious truth that He "has become the Firstfruits of them that are asleep."

CHAPTER VIII

THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION

I. *In Relation to Christ Himself*

§ 1. According to the New Testament and catholic doctrine,[1] two principal things happened in the resurrection: (*a*) Our Lord rose in flesh from the dead; (*b*) This reversal of death brought with it a mysterious exaltation of His Manhood, involving certain changes in His Body.

With regard to the first of these mysteries, we are told that His flesh did not see corruption,[2] — a statement which has, of course, to be interpreted consistently with the reality of His death, and with the testimony that blood and water flowed from His pierced side after His death. This peculiar flow seems to indicate two things, that He died of a broken heart,[3] and that the natural post-mortem result of such a form of death was not in the particular referred to prevented. Perhaps we may take the word corruption in this connection as meaning dissolution. His body remained substantially intact, being reanimated before dissolution had taken

[1] On the theology of the resurrection at large see references given on p. 164. n. 1, above.

[2] Acts ii. 27–37. Cf. Psa. xvi. 10.

[3] Cf. p. 201, above, where refs. are given.

place. If there was any supernatural staying of natural effects of death, His body did not in any case acquire the incorruptibility of its glorified state until the resurrection.[1]

In showing His wounds to the disciples Christ plainly meant to teach that His resurrection body was numerically identical with that in which He was crucified. The evidential aim with which He made this exhibition would have had no point, if it could be shown that the apostolic recognition of His body was mistaken. In His case this identity included a retention of the same material content; and this fact, and His having seen no corruption, differentiate His resurrection from ours.[2]

The resurrection was a restoration of the union between His human spirit and His flesh. The life of the flesh depends upon its being animated by its spiritual partner; and human nature is constituted a living reality, capable of full human functioning, only by the union of these two parts as properties of one personal subject or ego. Neither His flesh nor His soul were separated from our Lord's Person by His death, but they were mutually separated, and this constituted His death in the flesh, their mutual reunion being necessary for His resurrection.[3]

This resurrection constitutes a divine miracle. That is, it cannot be explained by any force or com-

[1] Cf. p. 147, above, where refs. on His not seeing corruption are given.

[2] See Bp. Pearson, fol. 381–384.

[3] See ch. v. § 2, above.

bination of forces resident in human nature. It can be accounted for only by an operation of higher efficiency than is ever exhibited by the forces and powers which the Creator has imparted to His creatures.[1] It was evidently caused by a special act of God. But "what things soever He doeth these also doeth the Son likewise," [2] because, by reason of their coessential unity, the divine Persons act indivisibly together in all their operations.[3] It is true that, as Son, the Lord derives His being participant in divine operations from the Father. It is from Him, in particular, that He receives the property of having life in Himself.[4] But this derivation is an eternal fact of the Godhead, and implies no inferiority in the power and action of the Son.

Being personally the eternal Son of God, Jesus Christ had power not only to lay down His life, but also to take it again.[5] And the resurrection was not less truly His own action than that of the Father. He raised Himself from the dead by power eternally pertaining to His Person; and this distinguishes His resurrection most sharply from all cases in which others have raised men from the dead. They have done so simply as agents of God, and by power

[1] Science bears witness thus far, that if the resurrection occurred as reported, it was miraculous. Cf. ch. vii. § 5, above.

[2] St. John v. 19.

[3] *The Trinity*, pp. 242–249, on circumcession.

[4] St. John v. 26.

[5] St. John x. 17–18.

divinely lent to them for the purpose and at the moment.

§ 2. The Gospel narratives are not less conclusive as to certain changes in our Lord's risen body than they are as to its fleshly identity with that in which He hung on the Cross. Its visibility and recognizability when seen were subject to His will, and it was neither seen nor recognized by any who were not His faithful disciples. It seems to have exhaled from His grave clothes without disturbing their enveloping position. It passed through closed doors, and seemed to have acquired new powers of motion and levitation.

These new properties represent a general change which, as the Apostles were guided to perceive, reveals a similar change to take place in the bodies of the saints in their resurrection at the last day. When St. Paul describes the change of our bodies hereafter, he is to be understood as indirectly describing what happened to the Lord's body at His resurrection.[1] In particular, it was changed from a *σῶμα ψυχικόν* to a *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, to a body brought into entire subjection to its inhabiting *πνεῦμα* or spirit. It was changed, again, from a state of dishonour, weakness, corruptibility and mortality to one of glory, power, incorruption and immortality, death being swallowed up in endless life.[2]

These changes are conventionally summed up under four heads: (*a*) subtlety, or entire subjection

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 20–23. [2] Cf. 2 Cor. v. 4.

to, and facile and plastic utility for, its inhabiting spirit;[1] (*b*) agility, or unwearied energy or activity;[2] (*c*) impassibility, or exemption from every form of pain and from death;[3] (*d*) glory, or transfiguration and external fitness for the functions of personal self-expression.[4] In this state of our Lord's risen body, the eternally intended dignity and spiritual purpose of the human body is first fully actualized and fulfilled; and the primary significance of the creation of matter is thereby revealed.[5]

§ 3. The event of our Lord's resurrection and glorification signified for him (*a*) His justification and (*b*) His reward.

When considered in connection with other relevant circumstances, the resurrection can be seen to vindicate the claim and mission of Christ, and therefore His character and teaching. The mere fact of resurrection from the dead, when considered by itself, cannot prove that the one who rises is all that Christ is believed to be; but the factual and didactic context of His resurrection gives it a definitive and evidential value which is far greater than that of

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 44.

[2] 1 Cor. xv. 43, It is raised in power.

[3] 1 Cor. xv. 42, 52–53; Revel. xxi. 4.

[4] St. Matt. xiii. 43; Dan. xii. 3. On these changes and properties, see St. Thomas, III. liv.–lv. 2 (cf. III. suppl. lxxxiii–lxxxviii); W. Milligan, *Resurrection of our Lord*, pp. 7–14; *Ascension*, pp. 15–20; H. P. Liddon, *Easter in St. Paul's*, pp. 80–83; D. Stone, pp. 101–102; B. F. Westcott, *Gospel of the Resurrection*, pp. 156–164.

[5] Cf. Col. i. 15–17. *Creation and Man*, pp. 83–84.

any other miracle. It is a miracle the lack of which would not only nullify belief in His having achieved redemption by His death on the Cross, but would have reduced His whole manifestation to a baffling enigma — as indeed His own disciples found it to be after His crucifixion, until the resurrection supplied the needed key to its solution.[1]

The relevant circumstances which impart to the resurrection its illuminative and evidential value fall under three heads: (*a*) His *prima facie* moral perfection; (*b*) His claims; (*c*) His teaching.

(*a*) That He impressed His followers as both free from sin and possessed of a combination of moral and spiritual perfections never previously witnessed among men, is apparent to every serious reader of the Gospels.[2] Of the union in Him of entire sincerity and unique sanity and wisdom all were convinced who came into really intimate contact with Him; so that His most difficult sayings, while dumfounding the understanding of His disciples, did not destroy

[1] Cf. St. Luke xxiv. 18–24. Modernists who seek to interpret the life of Christ without taking account of the resurrection, and to divorce the Easter message from the Easter fact (cf. Harnack, *What is Christianity?* with A. E. J. Rawlinson, *Dogma, Fact and Experience*, pp. 22–32) can escape the same confusion of mind only by mutilating the Gospel records, and by reducing the meaning of the Easter message. See Jas. Orr, pp. 23–26.

[2] On His sinless perfection, see *The Incarnation*, ch. viii. §§ 4–8; H. P. Liddon, *Divinity of our Lord*, pp. 163–198; D. Stone, pp. 77–81; E. D. la Touche, *op. cit.*, pp. 232–248; Hastings, *Dic. of Christ*, *s. v.* "Character of Christ"; Chas. Harris, *Pro Fide*, pp. 359–366, 388–400.

their conviction that His words were in any case words of life.[1]

(*b*) These words included assertions concerning Himself that would have come unnaturally from any mere man, and would therefore have appeared inconsistent with moral perfection even in a prophet, unless He were more than a prophet. Yet they seemed to be perfectly natural to Him, and did not upset the confidence of His disciples in His truthful humility. But it was a vital part of the impression which His character and claims produced upon their minds that as the promised Messiah and Redeemer He should triumph gloriously. His crucifixion, therefore, seemed to be a stultifying sequel to their previous experience of Him,[2] and they were reduced by it to the extremest confusion of mind and despondency, until the event of His resurrection at once vindicated His claim and revealed the redemptive meaning of His death.

(*c*) The resurrection recalled to their minds the predictions of it which Christ had made before His death — predictions which they had neither understood nor even attended to, because of their inability to take seriously His prediction of the crucifixion.[3] Once recalled, these predictions now became clear

[1] St. John vi. 68.

[2] Cf. Peter's recoil from Christ's prediction of His death, St. Matt. xvi. 21–22. Also St. Mark x. 32–34.

[3] Their memories were assisted by Christ Himself. St. Luke xxiv. 44–46. Cf. verses 6–8, the accuracy of which, however, is rejected by some critics.

evidences that their Friend had been pursuing a coherent purpose from the outset, and that this purpose — first made intelligible to them by His victory over death — was grander and more significant of His rank in being than they had previously been able to imagine.

All these things taken together led inevitably to the conclusion that His resurrection had declared Him to be "the Son of God with power," one whom they might adore as Lord and God without abandonment of belief in the unity of God.[1] Thus each element of His teaching that had seemed a "hard saying" when uttered by Him,[2] was afforded a background which vindicated its truth and threw dazzling light upon its meaning. Thenceforth Jesus Christ was confessed as Lord in a sense not susceptible of enhancement,[3] in a sense which inspired the disciples to dare all things and to die with a courageous confidence which has been communicated to succeeding generations, and which is still the basis of hope for all the ends of the earth.

The modernist regards the miracle of the resurrection as an obstacle to faith, because he regards it exclusively in relation to the natural course of events. The traditional Christian, on the other hand, finds it to be the primary support of his belief in Jesus Christ, because he views it in relation to the redemptive drama and self-manifestation of the eternal Son of

[1] Rom. i. 4; St. John xx. 28. [2] *E.g.* cf. St. John vi. 60.
[3] *The Incarnation*, pp. 42–46.

God, of which it is a vital part and the illuminative climax.[1] Because, and in so far as, it is the latter, it affords evidence of the very highest order.[2]

§ 4. The exaltation of Jesus Christ in His human nature, of which the resurrection and ascension were stages and evidences, constituted, among other things, the reward which had been won by His voluntary humiliation and perfect obedience unto death.[3] "Being in the form of God, He did not reckon his being on an equality with God to consist in grasping, but effaced Himself. That is, He took the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of men. And being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the Cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted Him, and gave unto Him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, . . . and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." [4]

In the interpretation of this classic passage, the stages of the mystery should receive careful attention. First of all came the Incarnation, an act of

[1] Cf. ch. vi. §§ 1, 2, 4, above.

[2] That is, to all who occupy the standpoint from which alone the evidence for the resurrection can be successfully estimated. Cf. ch. vi. § 11, above.

[3] On which subject, see W. Milligan, *Ascension*, pp. 35–57. Cf. W. J. S. Simpson, *Resurrection and Modern Thought*, ch. xix.

[4] Phil. ii. 6–11. On this rendering, see *The Incarnation*, pp. 229–235. Cf. an earlier study in *The Kenotic Theory*, pp. 57–70.

condescending love wherein the eternal Son willed to earn the glory justly due to Him by human obedience and death rather than by grasping it through an overpowering flashing forth of His Person. This act was divine, a wondrous exhibition of love and condescension, but not itself the winning of His reward.

The winning was human, although achieved by a divine Person and by the grace of union;[1] and both the merit and the reward of His incarnate life and work pertained to Him as Man, in His human nature. The causes of His human merit were two, His humiliation, or acceptance of dishonour instead of the esteem from men to which His character entitled Him, and His patient obedience to His Father's will — an obedience that involved a death which, all things considered, was personally the most painful ever endured by man.

The reward culminated in an honour given to Him in His Manhood, to His human name, which infinitely overshadows the disparagement that He underwent. That is, His resurrection and ascension have exalted His Manhood to the glory which properly pertains to it as the Manhood of the eternal Son of God, but which also is a proper sequel to the unique perfection and representative significance of His human obedience and death.

Thenceforth He is Lord over all in the nature wherein He was rejected of men, and that nature becomes the medium of our approach to the Father

[1] *The Incarnation*, p. 155.

through Him.[1] His glory is identified with that of the Father, and to glorify Him is to glorify the Father as well. The honour paid to His human name is in reality paid to His Person; and this is consistent with exclusive worship of the one true God, because His self-manifestation has shown Him to be of one essence with the Father, the very image of the Father's substance.[2]

II. *In Relation to the Plan of God*

§ 5. All temporal events have an eternal background, being the working out, and manifestation in temporal and humanly intelligible terms, of a will and purpose which is eternal and changeless. And the divine will is not less changeless, because the things willed are willed to take the form of a temporal and contingent drama. It is because of this nature of the effects by which God's eternal purpose is fulfilled that we speak of a divine plan, describing the will of God in terms of its effects and temporal manifestation.[3]

As St. Paul says, "the invisible things" of God "since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made." [4]

[1] Cf. ch. x. § 8, below.

[2] Χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως ἀυτοῦ, Heb. i. 3. Cf. Col. ii. 9, "For in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

[3] *Being and Attrib. of God*, pp. 253–256, 280–282; *Creation and Man*, pp. 5–13.

[4] Rom. i. 20.

The eternal is reflected, not less really because in part only, in the mirror of what we see;[1] and things visible, contingent and temporal make known to us, in trustworthy terms of our own experience, a will and plan which in its source and compass transcends our power adequately to describe. But this revelation has two branches.[2] The natural phenomena of the physical and moral order teach us that there is a God whose will explains all things, that His will is righteous, and that the course of this world is the working out of a plan in which our own growth in righteousness and our future destiny are central elements.

But this branch of revelation, teaching though it does the fact that there is a divine plan, and that our own future is involved, does not define the plan except to declare its moral quality and our vital interest in it. If we are to gain knowledge of whither we are tending, and of the provisions which God has afforded for our coming into authentic relations with Him and for an intelligent fulfilment by us of our part in promoting His plan, God must show His hand in a more definitive way. The supernatural and miraculous elements of human experience articulate and interpret the more general teaching of nature, without in the least nullifying its truth and value. The two revelations which we are distinguishing both come

[1] 1 Cor. xiii. 9–12.

[2] *Being and Attrib. of God*, pp. 225–226; *Introd. to Dogm. Theol.*, pp. 72–78.

from God, and together constitute a drama the meaning of which determines our relation to Him, our true ideal of life, and the destiny for which we are set to prepare ourselves.

The resurrection of our Lord from the tomb, when regarded in its context of antecedent and subsequent events and of inspired teaching, can be seen to be the most illuminative and definitive revelation of God's plan that has ever been given. It is this because it is more. It is a shifting of scenery in the divine drama, a movement in the working out of the whole world-plan of God which conditions, and determines the bearing of, all subsequent events. To perceive the place of the resurrection in the course of things at large is therefore to perceive its theological or divine meaning, so far as it can be understood by those who can know divine things only in part.[1]

§ 6. The resurrection is related to the Incarnation as its appropriate sequel and complement; and taken together these two mysteries bring to the surface, and minister to, the eternal purpose of creation. This purpose is centred in Jesus Christ, the eternal Son and "Image of the invisible God." Accordingly "all things were created by Him and for Him." The reasons and patterns of things preëxisted in Him, so that He is "the Firstborn in relation to all creation," and "in Him all things cohere."[2] God willed "that in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might

[1] Cf. ch. vi. § 4, above.

[2] Col. i. 15–18. Cf. 2. Cor. iv. 4; Heb. i. 3.

gather together in one all things in Christ."[1] To this end the visible creation has been recapitulated in, and subordinated to, man. And man has been made participant to a degree in divine reason, being thereby constituted a finite image of God, with a certain affinity to Him who is God's eternal Image and Logos.[2]

All this was preparatory, and led on in the divine purpose to the further movement which is historically revealed in the double mystery of the Incarnation and the resurrection. This further step has open reference to the summing up of all things in Christ, who is the eternal Logos. He became incarnate in order that, in accordance with the Father's will, He might in all things have the preëminence, and that through Him God might be all in all.[3] By taking our nature the Logos made His own that which recapitulates the whole visible order, thereby becoming the Head of the human race, the Second Adam, and establishing a vital relationship and subordination of all creation to Himself.[4] The Manhood which He took becomes in turn the medium through which men, and the visible order in relation to them, are to be brought to a higher level in their long development, and are finally to be endowed with incorruption and glory in a new or renovated Heaven and earth.[5]

[1] Eph. i. 10.

[2] Gen. i. 26–28. Cf. Psa. viii. 4–6 (with Heb. ii. 6–11); Acts xxvi. 29; 1 Cor. xi. 7; Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10; St. Jas. iii. 9.

[3] 1 Cor. xv. 24–28.

[4] 1 Cor. xv. 20–23. Cf. Rom. v. 15–19; St. John xv. 1–6; xvii. 21–23.

[5] Revel. xxi. 5.

The resurrection is a necessary movement in the working out of this purpose. It represents an initial victory of our nature over corruption, a victory which not only revealed that Jesus Christ was one who could not be holden of death, but also elevated our nature in Him so that it should become the source and vehicle of incorruption to the human race.[1] Thus the resurrection made it possible that His body, thereby made immortal and life-giving, should become, by the Holy Spirit's operation, the nucleus of the Church, which has become "His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all."[2] In the Church the eternal purpose of God is carried through to its fruition; and the "creative push,"[3] which moderns are wont to describe in evolutionary terms, justifies itself by evolving an imperishable kingdom of God, to the development of which the most diverse forms of life are made to minister.[4]

§ 7. The place of the death of Christ in history has been dealt with in several previous chapters. The fact of sin has disturbed the plan of God in relation to mankind, as above described; and this disturbance has retarded the development of the kingdom of God, to which all things were designed to minister. It has done more than this. It has made the fulfilment of

[1] Acts ii. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 20–23; Phil. iii. 21. Cf. pp. 23–24, above, on the view of Irenæus and St. Athanasius.

[2] Eph. i. 23. Cf. Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 12–13, 27; Eph. iv. 4, 12–13, 15–16; v. 30; Col. i. 18.

[3] The allusion is, of course, to H. Bergson, *Creative Evolution*.

[4] *Creation and Man*, pp. 82–84.

the purpose of creation impossible except by divine intervention for the achievement of redemption and salvation from sin. Redemption brings the power of salvation in and through Christ, and is a divine work, although one that had to be achieved in human nature. Salvation, thereby made possible, is also a divine work in part, but requires for its fruition our response to, and coöperation with, divine grace in the Body of Christ.

The death of Christ constituted the historic form and means of redemption, but did this only as issuing in victory over death by His resurrection in the fulness of our nature from the tomb. The resurrection, then, is the mystery by which our Lord's redemptive death is made effective. And the victory over death which it completes also transfigures the human instrument of our Lord's sacrifice for sin, and converts it into a living, sacramental and abiding memorial of this sacrifice. Thus the resurrection enables the sacrifice which was made on the Cross to live on in a permanent and saving priesthood, and to serve as its abiding consecration.[1]

§ 8. The death of Christ, as made effective by His resurrection, redeems mankind, and affords the permanent historic basis of a dispensation of grace whereby two comprehensive benefits are brought within human reach. These benefits are: (*a*) salva-

[1] On the relation of Christ's resurrection to His death, see ch. iii. § 7, above; and W. Milligan, pp. 136–152; W. J. S. Simpson, *Our Lord's Resurrection*, pp. 215–222; L. Pullan, pp. 203–205.

tion from sin and reconciliation to God; (*b*) renewal of the spiritual development by which men are fitted for their destiny in the kingdom of God.

The resurrection not only completes the work of redemption; but, as explained in the previous section, it also transforms the Manhood in which redemption was accomplished into an abiding, living and objective memorial of its accomplishment. By appearing for us in it, our risen and ascended Redeemer perpetually and effectively intercedes for us, and becomes our living Saviour.[1] But the resurrection does more than this. It makes the Saviour's Manhood incorruptible and immortal, and constitutes it to be the source and medium of quickening, saving and sanctifying grace to those for whom He died.

Salvation is mediated to us by Jesus Christ, but in and through the Manhood which He offered up for us on Calvary. This Manhood is fitted for such use by the perfecting mystery of suffering,[2] and by its victory over death and acquisition of quickening power. In it the Holy Spirit abides, and from it He sheds forth the life and grace of Christ. For the accomplishment of this work the Spirit mystically extends the Body of Christ to this world; and by incorporating the subjects of salvation into it, He makes them regenerate participants in the grace which Christ merited for us by His death. Thus the

[1] On the heavenly priesthood, see ch. x, below.

[2] Heb. ii. 9–18.

Manhood of Christ becomes a leaven, an infusion, imparted to our wounded nature, in the working of which all possibilities of recovery and renewed progress are assured to us.[1] There is no magic in this, but a dispensation in which potentialities are created in us that have to be actualized by our own moral response, and by our working out our salvation with fear and trembling.

It can be seen that the whole plan of our recovery and advance is accommodated to human nature. Being constituted in life by the union of body and spirit, our spirits are conditioned in all functioning and experience by the sacramental principle — by external *media* and temporal operations. Therefore the benefits of saving and sanctifying grace are made available through the historic events of the Incarnation, death and resurrection of our Saviour, and are mediated to us through an infusion which we can effectively assimilate, since it is a substance like our own, perfected and made life-giving to us.[2] We can also perceive that in this plan of salvation the resurrection is far more than an evidential miracle.[3] It is a divinely accomplished movement upon which all that follows and all our hopes depend.

[1] A subject which is to be developed in the next volume. But cf. ch. iii. §§ 9–12, above.

[2] Cf. ch. iii. §§ 3–4, above.

[3] It is evidential to those who have assimilated Christian verities; and its failure to convince others does not arise from intrinsic defects, but from their alien standpoint, which blinds them to its credibility and implications. Cf. ch. vi. § 4.

III. *In Relation to Us*

§ 9. Resuming what has just been said, whatever Christ has done for us and is doing for us and in us flows from the relation in which He stands to us as the new Head of our race, the Second Adam. By taking our nature He identified Himself with us, and by His redemptive sufferings He earned the lordship with which His resurrection and ascension at the Father's right hand endows Him. But His lordship is not external. The nature which He assumed, and in which He now reigns, is our nature; and in its exalted state it is susceptible of mystical extension. This extension is the work of the Holy Spirit, who incorporates us by Baptism into the Body of Christ, and thus creates an interior relationship through which our identification with Him becomes organic and life-giving to us, as well as moral.

In the physical order, the result of this relationship is that our bodies are charged, so to speak, with a new principle of life. They become susceptible of change from the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* to the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, and of final resurrection to incorruption and immortality at the second coming of Christ. The infusion of this vital principle is accomplished by our baptismal incorporation into the Body of Christ; and the spiritual body then begins to grow in us. It is nourished by the sacramental food of our Lord's flesh and blood, and achieves its triumphant transformation of our corruptible flesh into the body of our

resurrection life under the moral and spiritual conditions of our growth in grace after the likeness of Jesus Christ.[1] This growth continues after death, and is the mystery which assures us that this corruptible is not annihilated by its carnal dissolution, but in the last day is to put on incorruption.[2]

By His resurrection our Lord became "the Firstfruits of them that are asleep," because that event accomplished for His Manhood the exaltation to immortality which, through our union therewith, becomes potential to us. It is as members of His Body that we partake of His life; and through this participation we become subjects of the change at the last day from that which is merely animal, ψυχικόν, to that which is spiritual, πνευματικόν, after His likeness.

That there is also a resurrection of the wicked is unmistakably revealed,[3] but of its nature and results we know little. Its explanation can be nothing else than the power of God.[4] We do know this, however, that the kind of resurrection that is promised to the

[1] Cf. St. John vi. 50–58; 1 St. John v. 11–12; Ephes. iv. 15–16. See W. Milligan, pp. 183–188.

[2] 1 Cor. xv. 53–54. Cf. Rom. vi. 5. Obviously a body which has ceased to exist cannot even be enabled to put on incorruption. On the relation of Christ's resurrection to the resurrection of our bodies, see St. Thomas, III. lvi. 1; W. J. S. Simpson, *Resurrection and Modern Thought*, ch. xxii; A. P. Forbes, *Nicene Creed*, p. 235.

[3] St. John v. 28–29; Acts xxiv. 15; St. Matt. xxv. 31–35, 41; Rom. xiv. 10; 2 Cor. v. 10. Cf. Dan. xii. 2. See Bp. Pearson, fol. 384–385.

[4] Connected, however, in some way with our Lord's work, 1 Cor. xv. 22; and for judgment, 2 Cor. v. 10.

faithful is exhibited in our Lord's own resurrection. The afterfruits must be like the Firstfruits. We also know that our participation in His resurrection is based upon the interior relationship to Him which we enjoy through our incorporation into His body.[1] Herein lies the realization of the redemption of the body, and Jesus Christ in us is the hope of glory.[2]

§ 10. Human nature is substantially constituted by the union of flesh and spirit; and the full functioning and development of human persons is conditioned by this union. The fall of mankind, the redemption and the subsequent mysteries of grace are determined in their effects upon us by this constitution of our nature. In particular, the redemption of the body, above described, is the redemption of the human spirit as well; and apart from the latter, the former is an idle tale. If the resurrection of Christ makes possible the conversion of our corruptible bodies into spiritual ones, it does so because it enables our spirits to transcend their earthly weaknesses, and to subject their bodies to the uses for which they have learned through holy discipline to employ them.[3] The effects of the resurrection in relation to the body and the spirit of man are branches of one mystery of glorification.

In relation to our spirits, the initial effects of our Lord's resurrection — mediated through the Body of

[1] Cf. St. John vi. 39, 51, 54; 1 Cor. xv. 23.
[2] Rom. viii. 23; 1 Cor. vi. 13–20; Col. i. 27.
[3] Cf. ch. vii. § 11, above.

Christ, by our incorporation therein — is our justification.[1] And our justification is the inception of our sanctification and entire transformation in disposition and character, after the pattern of the righteousness of God in Christ. This whole mystery of justification and sanctification is made possible, both in inception and in progress, by Christ's meritorious redemption, and by the dispensation of grace which His resurrection opened up. But because of the peculiarly immediate causal relation in which the resurrection stands to the sacramental dispensation of grace, flowing from His glorified Manhood, Scripture connects justification primarily with that fact. In technical parlance the meritorious cause of justification is the death of Christ, but its direct causal antecedent is the resurrection.[2]

In view of the confusion of thought on this subject which sixteenth-century controversies have engendered, it is desirable here, as elsewhere,[3] to remind ourselves of the moral aspects of justification. It is a work of God, but it is neither a species of non-moral omnipotence nor a forensic fiction. The merits

[1] On which, see J. H. Newman, *Lecs. on Justification*, ix; H. P. Liddon, *Easter in St. Paul's*, xi. II; W. Milligan, pp. 153–159; W. J. S. Simpson, *op. cit.*, ch. xviii; St. Thomas, III. lvi. 2; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, pp. 116–118; M. F. Sadler, *Justification of Life*, ch. i. § II.

[2] Rom. iv. 25, "Who was delivered for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification."

[3] Cf. *Creation and Man*, pp. 343–347; and in this volume, ch. iii. § 12.

of Christ, and His redemptive death, afford the necessary historic basis of our being accounted righteous; but we are not accounted righteous by a purely forensic imputation of His righteousness to us. No such imputation is hinted at in the New Testament. It is our own faith that is imputed to us for righteousness, and it is so imputed because it is the actual inception in us of the righteousness which, when fullgrown, conforms us to the righteousness of Christ. That which has begun to grow in us is reckoned for what it will be when fullgrown. The child of God is valued for the Christlike man that the double mystery of regenerating grace and living faith has brought to birth.

Thus we are given the footing of children, to whom growth in righteousness is possible; and the grace of Christ's glorified Manhood flows into our souls to use in holy self-discipline and daily progress, until we attain "unto a fullgrown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Two things, the grace of Christ enabling us, and our own response and coöperation begun by faith, these together constitute the mode of our personal salvation and spiritual advance toward the destiny for which we were created. This destiny is life with God, made joyous by the assimilation of our characters to the righteousness of God.[1] "For as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the One shall the many be

[1] Cf. *Creation and Man*, pp. 206–208; and in this volume, p. 73.

made righteous;" [1] and to make righteous means infinitely more than acquittal. It means a process by which we are gradually enabled to become successful imitators of Christ and possessors of His righteousness.

§ 11. This righteousness has come to mankind as a new thing — that is, as something which changes the meaning and the perspectives of human conduct and character. The transition from natural morality to Christian righteousness is a revolution rather than a reformation, although the reformation of whatever is amiss in human life is involved. It is conversion to a new and supernatural standpoint, from which we are enabled to perceive the true goal of righteousness, and to reorganize our moral aims in abiding harmony with the eternal plan of God. In the new righteousness, Jesus Christ is central. That is, very God-incarnate is at once the Lord of our life, the goal of our growth and the key to the meaning of every action and virtue in this life and in the life to come.[2]

Non-Christian morality is primarily, often wholly, humanitarian; and in it the mundane welfare of man, individual and social, is supremely determinative.[3] The morality which Christ reveals, and by His

[1] Rom. v. 19.

[2] On which see St. Thomas, III. liii. 3; lvi. 1–2; H. P. Liddon, *Easter in St. Paul's*, xi. III; xx; xxiii; xxv. II; xviii; *Univ. Sermons*, 1st Series, pp. 192–215; A. P. Forbes, *Nicene Creed*, pp. 231–235; W. Milligan, pp. 18–24, 160–170, 183–195.

[3] Utilitarianism is essentially pagan, but revives among professing Christians whenever the supernatural side of their religion is obscured.

resurrection establishes and interprets, has God for its determinative *summum bonum*, and makes the practice of true religion the organizing element of righteousness.[1] Human welfare is not thereby sacrificed; but it is shown to be dependent upon something more fundamental than itself, and not to be attained by giving it the primary place in our ideal of this life. Man is made for God, and cannot attain to full self-actualization except in God, the way to whom is Jesus Christ.

The new law is one of love;[2] and although no one can love God who hates his brethren, it is the love of God which is primary.[3] It is primary because it determines the lines of conduct which brotherly love ought to dictate, and alone affords adequate basis and motive for such love. The new law is also one of imitation,[4] rather than of obedience to external requirements, and of liberty[5] rather than of puritanical legalism. This does not mean that obedience has been abolished;[6] but that enlightened discretion enables the converted Christian to find in the example of Jesus Christ a more powerful motive and a fuller

[1] *Creation and Man*, pp. 229–232, 243–246.

[2] St. Matt. v. 43–48; xxii. 36–40 (with St. Mark xii. 30; St. Luke xx. 25–28); St. John xiii. 34–35. Cf. Rom. xiii. 8–10; 1 Cor. xiii; Eph. v. 1–2; 1 St. John iv. 7–8, 12, 16, 20–21.

[3] "This is the first and great commandment," St. Matt. xxii. 37–38.

[4] Eph. v. 1–2. Cf. St. Matt. v. 48.

[5] Rom. iii. 23–28; vii. 5–6; viii. 1–2; 1 Cor. vi. 12; Gal. iv.

[6] Rom. iii. 31; vi. 1–2, 12–15; vii. 12–14; viii. 4–5; Gal. v. 13–16.

guidance than any code of precepts alone can afford.[1] Laws have still to be obeyed; but to a perfected Christian they have become helpful guide-posts on a road which he is eager to follow, rather than restrictions which are felt as such.

The imitation of Christ is the imitation of God, whose character has been exhibited by Christ in the terms of human conduct and character. And because to imitate Christ is to imitate God, His example is the standard of Christian righteousness, the very essence of which is godlikeness.[2] Man is made for fellowship with God, and such fellowship can neither be pleasing to God nor joyous to man, except on the basis of man's assimilation in character to God.

§ 12. The resurrection assures us that the long evolution of man will issue at length in our becoming "partakers of the divine nature, having escaped from the corruption that is in the world by lust."[3] We have been made in the image of God and after His likeness; and what that means for us is that, when we are fullgrown, human nature in us will attain to the stature to which it has attained in Christ.[4] "For if we have become united with Him by the likeness of His death, we shall be also by the likeness of His resurrection."[5] Through our baptismal union with

[1] Cf. Gal. v. 18, 24–25; St. Matt. xi. 28–30.

[2] *The Incarnation*, pp. 259–267.

[3] 2 St. Pet. i. 4.

[4] Eph. iv. 13. There are obvious limitations to this but not such as nullify the proposition. Our perfection is individual, His is catholic.

[5] Rom. vi. 5. Cf. 1 St. John iii. 2; Psa. xvii. 15.

Him even "now are we the children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be; but we know that . . . we shall be like Him." Awaking at last after His likeness, we shall be satisfied with it.[1]

This goal of human development was eternally purposed by the Creator, whose love for man signifies His will that we should be with Him forever. God is not dependent upon us for His fulness; but because He is love, the spontaneous expression of His fulness is creative.[2] It brings forth and develops personal beings, capable of enjoying Him forever. The joy of love is mutual; and this mutuality implies something in common, something which enables each to recognize what is lovable in the other as in some sense a reflection of himself. And so God wills that human development shall produce a race of beings who shall be in a very real sense partakers of His own nature. To this end, in the fulness of time, He sent His eternal Son to become Man, in order that through union with Him we might, in the rhetorical language of the ancients, become God;[3] and the resurrection reveals what we are to become, and makes the consummation possible.

We shall not indeed be literally deified, for the finite cannot become infinite, and whatever we become we continue to be creatures, evermore dependent upon our Maker for all that we are and enjoy.

[1] 1 St. John iii. 2; Psa. xvii. 16 (Prayer Book version).

[2] Cf. *Creation and Man*, pp. 63–64.

[3] Cf. pp. 23–24, above, where refs. are given.

Nor shall we be merged and lost in God. The glory of our future life in Him is love; and the very nature of love shows that its continuance implies mutuality and an abiding distinction between persons.[1] None the less our enjoyment of God, and our perfect enjoyment of the communion of saints as well, will be based upon real participation in the divine. The lines of this participation, as revealed in the second Head of our race, are chiefly three: (*a*) incorruption and immortality; (*b*) glorification; (*c*) character, patterned after that of Jesus Christ.

When we shall have attained to all this, the kingdom of God will be fully actualized; and the long-continued creative push of life will have accomplished the mystery which evolutionary science has dimly detected to be working in the organic world. What science detects and generalizes the resurrection articulates and interprets by exhibiting the Firstfruits of the life of the world to come. But this interpretation is given in terms which, from the nature of the case, are intelligible only to those who have learned to understand Jesus Christ, in whom all that is proper to God is personally united with all that is proper to man when he is fullgrown.[2]

[1] The error here combated is often found in connection with a spurious mysticism. Cf. W. K. Fleming, *Mysticism in Christianity*, p. 14; *Cath. Encyc., q. v., fin.* On pantheism, see *Being and Attrib. of God*, pp. 220–224.

[2] Cf. *Creation and Man*, pp. 82–84; *Incarnation*, pp. 83–84.

CHAPTER IX

THE ASCENSION

I. *The Forty Days*

§ 1. The ascension of our Lord was the inevitable sequel of His resurrection.[1] He thereby completed His earthly manifestation, and assumed the place at the Father's right hand, which was proper to Him. But this withdrawal was delayed for forty days, because He still had things to do on earth which He could not do effectively until after His resurrection.[2]

His first post-resurrection work was to convince His disciples that He had indeed overcome death, and to enable them to adjust their mental and practical attitude towards Him in the light of this illuminating event. To this end He repeatedly appeared to them; and the manner of His appearances not only afforded adequate evidence that His whole Manhood

[1] On the Ascension at large and the mysteries which it initiated, see W. Milligan, *Ascen. and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord;* St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, III. lvii–lviii; Bp. Pearson, *Apos. Creed*, art. vi; H. P. Liddon, *Univ. Sermons*, 1st Series, xi; Geo. Milligan, *Theol. of the Ep. to the Hebrews;* M. F. Sadler, *One Offering*, chh. vii–ix; J. Grimal, *Priesthood and Sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ*, Pt. III. Only the authors will be given in refs. to these works.

[2] On His forty days' work, see Geo. Moberly, *Great Forty Days;* P. G. Medd, *One Mediator*, Lec. vii; St. Thomas, III. lv.

had been recovered from the power of death, but also revealed changes which His disciples needed to apprehend if they were rightly to understand the meaning of His resurrection and His future relationship to them. The relations engendered by their previous contact with Him had now to be absorbed in higher ones — relations which the disciples were not able to grasp until His verbal claims were interpreted to them by the objective manifestations of His post-resurrection state. Moreover, one manifestation was not enough; and by repeating His appearances to the disciples our Lord accommodated Himself to their slow understandings.

They had accepted Him as master,[1] and had even acknowledged His messianic claim.[2] But their acknowledgement had been qualified in value by messianic conceptions which they had to outgrow before they could understand Him. The resurrection taught them for the first time that to suffer crucifixion was consistent with, was part of, the Messiah's work; and in teaching this it taught more. It imparted a previously unsuspected meaning to the many intimations of His Person which Christ had all along been giving them; and now, as they saw their risen Master, they began to adjust their relations to Him as to their Lord and God.[3] This

[1] St. John xiii. 13.

[2] St. Matt. xvi. 16. Cf. St. Mark viii. 29; St. Luke ix. 20.

[3] Thomas' exclamation, St. John xx. 28, need not, however, be regarded as made with full realization of its apparent meaning and implications.

adjustment was stupendous, and could not be accomplished at once. Therefore the fifty days which elapsed after the resurrection before the Holy Spirit came afforded none too long a period of preparation for the propaganda which the Apostles had to undertake.

§ 2. The question as to whether Christ intended to found a Church has been much discussed of late.[1] The Church of God in its more comprehensive sense did not originate in apostolic days. Rather it then received its final earthly form and endowment with the Holy Spirit, becoming thereby the Body of Christ and the earthly source of truth and grace to all the nations. In a sense, therefore, Christ did not found the Church. But He reconstituted it, and did found the organization of it which we call apostolic.[2] In this sense He founded the Christian Church, which is "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus Himself being its chief corner stone."[3]

The fact that He came as the promised Messiah to preach and establish the kingdom of God seems to carry with it the purpose of creating some machinery

[1] It was questioned by E. Hatch, *Organization of the Early Christian Church.*

[2] On which, see Chas. Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, ch. i; H. B. Swete, *Holy Cath. Church*, pp. 5–8; W. J. S. Simpson, *Cath. Conception of the Church*, ch. ii; D. Stone, *Christian Church*, ch. iii; E. T. Green, *Church of Christ*, pp. 16–23.

[3] Eph. ii. 20. Cf. St. Matt. xxi. 42 and parallels; Acts iv. 11; 1 St. Pet. ii. 7.

by which its interests should be fostered and its members should be brought into effective mutual relationship and coöperation. He instituted Baptism as the means of entrance into the kingdom,[1] and thus created a visible *ecclesia*. He implied that this Church was to have some corporate method of judging its members, when He declared that those who refused to hear the Church were to be treated "as the Gentile and the publican." [2] He instituted the Holy Eucharist as a social sacrament, one which, in fact, became the central corporate function by which the religious life of the Christian Church was unified.[3] The training and commissioning of the twelve, of which we shall speak in our next section, the pains which He took to differentiate them from the rest of His disciples, and His giving them the keys of the kingdom,[4] show that the *ecclesia* was to have an identifiable organization.

This, the natural interpretation of Christ's actions and teachings, is borne out by the fact that when the promised descent of the Holy Spirit took place, the followers of Christ constituted a society under apostolic government. And this society is treated by New Testament writers as the Body of Christ,[5] inhabited by the Spirit,[6] to which men were added daily

[1] St. Matt. xxviii. 19. Cf. St. John iii. 5.
[2] St. Matt. xviii. 17.
[3] 1 Cor. xi. 23–26. Cf. x. 16–17.
[4] St. Matt. xvi. 18–19; St. John xx. 22–23. Cf. St. Matt. xix. 28.
[5] Eph. i. 22–23. etc.
[6] 1 Cor. xii. 12–13; Eph. iv. 4, 16.

who were being saved.[1] In the face of all these patent facts, the denial that Christ intended to organize a Church cannot be made good.

§ 3. Our Lord gave to the Apostles their final and formal commission after His resurrection. He had trained them under Jewish conditions, and the passing mission on which He had sent them for their training was confined to Jewry.[2] There were obvious reasons for this limitation. The Jewish Church was the Christian Church in the making, a preparatory dispensation in one divine plan, the limitations of which had to be observed until all things were ready and the descent of the Spirit had completed the establishment of the new order. Moreover, as subsequent events were to show, the wider and catholic scope of the new dispensation could not be fully grasped by the Apostles until post-pentecostal developments, as interpreted by the Spirit, had enlarged their vision.

Then the catholicity of the terms of their final commission from Christ began to be realized. "All authority hath been given unto Me in Heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teach-

[1] Acts ii. 47. Cf. verse 42.

[2] St. Matt. x. 5 ff. and parallels. On the training of the twelve, see *The Incarnation*, pp. 342–343; H. Latham, *Pastor Pastorum;* Hastings, *Dic. of Christ*, *s. v.* "Apostles"; A. B. Bruce, *Training of the Twelve.*

ing them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."[1] We are driven by the evidence as a whole to believe that the words in the fourth Gospel as uttered by Christ on another occasion were also addressed to His Apostles, or if to the disciples in general, to them as constituting an *ecclesia* of which the Apostles were the official representatives. "As My Father has sent Me, even so send I you. And . . . He breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."[2] St. Luke, who does not give the precise terms of the apostolic commission, describes in the Acts its catholic scope, and mentions the promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit, whereby the Apostles were to receive power.[3]

When we analyze the language of the commission, and connect it with certain elements of Christ's previous teaching, we find sufficient confirmation of the doctrine concerning the apostolate which has determined the policy of the Catholic Church from New Testament days to the present time. We find

[1] St. Matt. xxviii. 18–20. Cf. St. Mark xvi. 15.

[2] St. John xx. 21–23.

[3] Acts i. 2–8. The breathing on them of Christ, and His words connected therewith, must surely be regarded as signifying what was to be fulfilled by the Spirit's descent in tongues of fire. In addition to the refs. on Christ founding the Church given above, see Geo. Moberly, *Sayings of the Great Forty Days*, III.

such confirmation, that is, when we take our Lord's words naturally, and in the light of their practical effect upon the pentecostal Church. That the Church should have erred from the beginning in so vital a matter, and have ascribed divine authority to arrangements which were merely human accidents of ecclesiastical development, is a conclusion so incredible that nothing short of full demonstration can justify its adoption. To discuss at large the controversies which have in our day confused many minds with regard to this subject, would carry us too far afield from the subject of this volume.[1] We can only summarize here the chief elements of Christ's teaching concerning the apostolate, as they have all along been understood by the Church.

(*a*) The apostolate was not a passing mission, but an abiding office designed to continue until the end of the Christian dispensation.[2] And the members of it were clearly differentiated from the rest of the Church by functions and prerogatives in which the faithful at large had no formal or official share. We do not reduce the significance of this conclusion when we also insist, as we must, that their functions were organic functions of the whole Christian body, of the Body of Christ — a relation of things which is in-

[1] The ministry of the Church will be treated more fully in the next volume. Among the best works are R. C. Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood;* Chas. Gore, *The Church and the Ministry;* and *Orders and Unity.*

[2] "Lo I am with you always," etc., St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

consistent with anything like an external lordship or an independent superior caste.[1]

(*b*) The appointed functions of the apostolate were those of Jesus Christ, in so far as they were to be perpetuated in this world,[2] whether prophetic, priestly or kingly; and they constituted a stewardship which was to be exercised until Christ's second coming in glory.[3] This does not mean that the Apostles were to be additional mediators between God and man, but that they were to be ministers of Christ and functional organs of His Body.[4]

(*c*) When it became clear to the original Apostles that our Lord's second coming was not to take place in their day, it also became apparent to them — and they were guided in this by the Holy Spirit — that they must provide for a continuance of their ministry after their departure.[5] And the threefold ministry which originated in apostolic days, and which has been continued ever since in the Church, is rightly regarded as the divinely intended perpetuation of the original apostolate.[6]

[1] On this organic aspect, see Geo. Moberly, *Administration of the Holy Spirit*, pp. 47 ff.

[2] St. John xx. 21.

[3] Cf. St. Luke xii. 41–43.

[4] Cf. Eph. iv. 11–16; Col. ii. 19; 1 Cor. xii. 13–30.

[5] According to St. Clement, writing about 95 A.D., *ad Corinth.*, ch. 44, they were forewarned with reference to this by Christ Himself.

[6] That is, so far as its normal or ministerial functions were concerned. The functions of the Apostles as co-founders with Christ of the Christian *ecclesia* were, of course, peculiar and passing.

§ 4. St. Luke tells us that after His resurrection our Lord spoke to His disciples "the things concerning the kingdom of God," [1] and He must have said many things of which we have no record. Conjecture has been busy with this subject, and what men have thought He ought to have said has been put forward as if He had been proved to have said it. There is no reason to suppose that our Lord then enlarged the substantial range of His previous teaching. He seems to have contented Himself with helping the disciples, in the light of His resurrection, better to understand the bearing of His teaching, and to face the great work which His commission imposed on them.

We are tempted, in particular, to think that Christ must have explained details of ecclesiastical organization and sacramental institutions. There is no evidence of this, nor was it necessary. He had expressly postponed teaching many things until the Spirit should come; and what the Spirit guided the Apostles to establish, in the light of practical emergencies when they actually arose, we believe to have the authority of Jesus Christ. Our Lord confined His legislation to a very few central things, things which had to be established in order that His Church might be ready for the descent of the Spirit. His teaching was habitually concerned with principles rather than rules.[2]

[1] Acts i. 3.

[2] See Henry Cotterill, *Genesis of the Church.*

In helping his disciples to adjust their minds to the new conditions, our Lord appropriated the Old Testament to Christian use and interpreted it in a new and higher meaning — a meaning transcending what we have reason to think the Old Testament writers had in mind, but one which was not less the meaning which the Scriptures were intended of God to unfold when the Messiah should come. "And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, He interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself."[1] He who did this had been the divine Revealer in every stage of previous history;[2] and the meaning which He unfolded in Scripture must be its true and final spiritual meaning, whether contained in the conscious thought of the writers or not. It is as if workmen of unequal intelligence had built the nave of a Church, and then the completion and unveiling of the sanctuary had made clear the architect's meaning, intended all along, and determining once for all the significance of every part.[3]

And our Lord's teaching in this direction not only uncovered the teaching of the Old Testament concerning Himself, but sanctioned a method of interpretation which is observed by New Testament writers, and which must be observed, if we would

[1] St. Luke xxiv. 27.

[2] The Revealer is the eternal Word; the Inspirer of the writers, and of the Bible, is the Holy Spirit. See *The Incarnation*, pp. 272–273; Wm. Lee, *Inspiration*, pp. 22 ff.

[3] This idea is developed in the writer's pamphlet, *The Bible and Modern Criticism.*

retain the Old Testament as Scripture.[1] The value of what is called critical exegesis, which seeks to ascertain the exact thought of the writer in each scriptural passage, is not destroyed by the principle we are defining. For we cannot adequately understand the bearing of what Old Testament writers wrote upon what was yet to be revealed, unless we understand what they wrote and meant. But that the Old Testament has acquired a higher meaning in the light of the New, and that this meaning is divine, there can be no serious question among consistent believers in Jesus Christ as the fulfilment of messianic prophecy. In the light of this fulfilment the Old Testament is no longer a mere series of memorials of Israel's religious development. It has become a register of divine training of the Jews to receive Christ, and to convey the knowledge of His salvation to the whole world.[2]

II. *The Withdrawal*

§ 5. The direct testimony concerning the fact of the ascension is confined to the supplement of St. Mark's Gospel, the date and source of which is uncertain, and to St. Luke's descriptions in his Gospel and in the Acts. The first of these testimonies is very brief, giving neither the time nor the circumstances. "So then the Lord Jesus, after He had

[1] Its use is especially prominent in *The Epis. to the Hebrews.*

[2] See *Authority, Eccles. and Biblical*, pp. 246–249, 251–254.

spoken unto them, was received up into Heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God." St. Luke is more full. In his Gospel he says, "And He led them out until they were over against Bethany: and He lifted up His hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass while He blessed them, He parted from them and was carried up into Heaven." Again, in the Acts, he mentions our Lord's appearances after the resurrection as "by the space of forty days." When Christ had been speaking, "as they were looking, He was taken up; and a cloud received Him out of their sight. And while they were looking steadfastly into Heaven as He went, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, ye men of Galilee, why stand ye looking up into Heaven? This Jesus, which was received up from you into Heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld Him going into Heaven."[1]

But if only St. Luke gives a descriptive account, there are enough allusions to the ascension in the New Testament to show that the fact was generally accepted by the Apostles and their followers. We also have our Lord's own veiled prophecy, as reported by St. John. "What then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where He was before?"[2] A few of the allusions should be mentioned. St. Paul describes Heaven as a place "from whence

[1] St. Mark xvi. 19; St. Luke xxiv. 50–51; Acts i. 3, 9–11.

[2] St. John vi. 62. Cf. St. Matt. xxvi. 64 and His saying several times that He was going away to the Father, St. John xiv. 28; xvi. 5, 10, 17, 28. Cf. St. John xx. 17.

. . . we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ."[1] Among leading elements of the "great mystery of godliness" he mentions our Lord as being "received up in glory."[2] Elsewhere he says, "He that descended is the same also that ascended far above all the heavens, that He might fill all things."[3] St. Peter describes Christ as "on the right hand of God, having gone into Heaven."[4] Another writer describes Christ as having "sat down at the right hand of the throne of God."[5] In the Apocalypse our Lord is described as enthroned in the heavens.[6]

Unless we are prepared altogether to reject the apostolic belief in the ascension, we have no reason for not accepting St. Luke's account of the event. Recent investigations have confirmed the general credibility of his narratives, and there is nothing suspicious in his description of the ascension except to those whose naturalistic bias precludes belief in the fact. In his description the essential points are: (*a*) that our Lord was taken up towards the sky; (*b*) that He disappeared in a cloud; (*c*) that this was His final withdrawal into Heaven until He should come again at the end of the world.[7]

[1] Phil. iii. 20.
[2] 1 Tim. iii. 16.
[3] Eph. iv. 10.
[4] 1 St. Pet. iii. 22. Cf. Acts ii. 33.
[5] Heb. xii. 2. Cf. ii. 9.
[6] Revel. i. 13; v. 11–13; vi. 9–17; xiv. 1–5.
[7] On the fact of the ascension, see W. Milligan, Lec. i; W. J. S. Simpson, *Our Lord's Resurrection*, ch. ix; E. D. la Touche, *Person of Christ*, pp. 323–325; R. J. Knowling, *Witness of the Epistles*, pp. 397–414; H. B. Swete, *Apostles' Creed*, pp. 64–70; Hastings, *Dic. of Bible, q. v.; Dic. of Christ, q. v.*, 3–4.

§ 6. It has been shown in this volume, in connection with the subject of Christ's descent into Hell,[1] that the popular hypothesis that Heaven and Hell are not local, but represent states respectively of happiness and misery, is not in accord with either the teaching of Scripture or the possibilities of human nature. The notion grows out of what is really a Manichæan prejudice against the body, and inability to realize the abiding usefulness of matter to our spirits, even in the world to come.[2] No doubt our Lord's flesh ceased after His resurrection to be *hampered* by space relations, and gained a facility of movement which is greater than we can imagine. But as real body it was necessarily still dimensional and locally present somewhere at all times.

The language of the fourth Article of Religion may seem to need expansion in order to avoid onesidedness; but as a correct statement of the lower side of the mystery — a side which is of vital significance — we may not reject its teaching. "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones and all things pertaining to man's nature; wherewith He ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth, until He return to judge all men at the last day." In short, the ascension signifies a transfer of our Lord's physical and local presence from earth to Heaven.

It is entirely consistent with this affirmation to acknowledge that the movement of His body which

[1] In ch. v. § 7. [2] Cf. ch. vii. §§ 11-12, above.

the Apostles witnessed, the fact of which is an article of the catholic faith, was symbolical.[1] That is, while His upward movement into a cloud fittingly indicated His withdrawal into Heaven, and did so in the only available way, it did not reveal where Heaven is. What the Apostles saw was a manner of departure from this world which indicated Heaven as the goal of His movement; but they saw only the withdrawal, not the goal of His journey. The vital importance of the movement which they did see lies in its constituting Christ's revelation of His going to Heaven, and of the manner of His return at the end of the world;[2] and upon our assurance of the fact depends our faith in the completion of the exaltation of His Manhood, and in His present work for our salvation as heavenly Prophet, Priest and King.

It is useless for us to endeavour to discover where Heaven is until, if God so please, we come to it. Expressed in the terms of our earthly spatial measures, it may be remote beyond imagination. In which case we have need to remember the relativity of space, and the possibility that in heavenly measures the distance may be small. It is also possible that Heaven is immediately around us, and that, even in the physical sense, the ascended Lord is nearer than we think. He is somewhere in the body, and where He is constitutes the localizing centre of Heaven.

[1] It is symbolical in the fact that it did not *fully* reveal the mystery; but it is not less a fact, falling within apostolic experience.

[2] Acts i. 11.

§ 7. The ascension was completed by the mystery of our Lord's session or enthronement at the right hand of the Father, whereby was consummated the exaltation in His Manhood, which He merited through His self-effacing and obedient humiliation and death.[1] The phrase "right hand of the Father" is obviously figurative, for the Father is infinite Spirit and has no physical members. The figure has never proved misleading, and is readily understood as signifying exaltation to divine glory and power, above even the angelic hosts.[2]

Scripture describes our Lord in glory in various ways, each description being suggested by some aspect of His heavenly state and work. He is the one Mediator between God and man in a new covenant,[3] the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him, the Prince of life and the Firstbegotten from the dead.[4] His prophetic office appears in His being called the faithful and true Witness.[5] As Priest,[6] He is our Passover, sacrificed for us,[7] a Lamb standing as though it had been slain,[8] who appears before the face of God for us, ever living to make intercession for us,[9] and being our Advocate with the

[1] Either direct or indirect witness to the session occurs in St. Mark app. xvi. 19; Acts vii. 55; Rom. viii. 34; Eph. i. 20; Col. iii. 1; Heb. i. 3, 13; viii. 1; xii. 2; 1 St. Pet. iii. 22; Revel. v. 6. See St. Thomas, III. lvii; Bp. Pearson, fol. 275 *et seq.*

[2] Heb. i. 4–14.

[3] 1 Tim. ii. 5; Heb. xii. 24.

[4] Heb. v. 9; Acts iii. 15; Revel. i. 5.

[5] Revel. iii. 14. Cf. i. 5.

[6] Heb. v. 6 *et passim.*

[7] 1 Cor. v. 7.

[8] Revel. v. 6. Cf. v. 9, 12; xiii. 8.

[9] Heb. ix. 24; vii. 25.

Father, the Propitiation for our sins,[1] and the Bestower of gifts upon men.[2] As King, He is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords,[3] the Lion of the tribe of Judah and the Lord of glory.[4] With all these high qualities and functions, He is still Shepherd of the sheep, the same yesterday, to-day and forever.[5] Nothing of His human experience and suffering is forgotten by Him; but retaining the nature in which He was made perfect by suffering, He continues to identify Himself with us as His brethren. For He was "made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God. . . . For in that He himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted." [6]

§ 8. St. Luke tells us that while the disciples "were looking steadfastly into Heaven as He went, behold two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, ye men of Galilee, why stand ye looking into Heaven? This Jesus, which was received up from you into Heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld Him going into Heaven." [7] These words reëchoed a prediction made by our Lord Himself on various occasions, once under solemn

[1] 1 St. John ii. 1–2.
[2] Eph. iv. 8.
[3] 1 Tim. vi. 15. Cf. Revel. xvii. 14; xix. 16.
[4] Revel. v. 5; 1 Cor. ii. 8.
[5] Heb. xiii. 20, 8. Cf. St. John x. 11; 1 St. Pet. ii. 25.
[6] Heb. ii. 10–11, 17–18.
[7] Acts i. 10–11.

circumstances when adjured by the high priest to declare whether He was the Christ or not.[1] His emphasis caused the prediction to sink deeply into the consciousness of the Church, and the expectation of His second coming gains expression in various parts of the apostolic writings.[2] It is enshrined in the catholic creeds as an article of the Christian faith, necessary to be believed, because of the judgment which it is also predicted the Lord will then render on all men, according to their deeds done in the body.[3]

Modern rationalism discovers in the eschatological teaching of Christ a mere reflection of current Jewish ideas, and rejects both the second advent and the general judgment. Rationalists seize on what they believe to be evidence that Christ erred in any case as to the nearness of His second coming, and in this find justification for thinking that He was at fault in His teaching as to a future cataclysm and general judgment. This attack is formally based upon grounds of critical inquiry into our Lord's words, and something must be said as to these grounds; but the clearest possible refutation of the critical argument would not convince those who make the

[1] St. Matt. xxvi. 64; St. Mark xiv. 62. Cf. St. Matt. xvi. 27; xxiv. 30; xxv. 31; St. Luke xxi. 27; St. John i. 51.

[2] *E.g.* 1 Cor. i. 7; xv. 23; Phil. iii. 20; 1 Thess. i. 10; iii. 13; iv. 16–17; 2 Thess. i. 10; Tit. ii. 13; St. Jas. v. 7; 1 St. Pet. i. 7; St. Jude 14; Revel. i. 7.

[3] St. Matt. xiii. 40–43, 49–50; xvi. 27; xxv. 31–46; Acts xvii. 31; 1 Cor. iv. 5; 2 Cor. v. 10; 2 Thess. i. 7–8; 2 Tim. iv. 1; St. Jude 14–15; Revel. vi. 15–17; xx. 11–15.

attack, for their naturalistic standpoint would remain as a fatal hindrance to faith in this direction.

That our Lord made use of Jewish imagery in His eschatological discourses is true, but this imagery grew out of Old Testament prophecy [1] and was on correct general lines. In order to vindicate our Lord's teaching we do not need to prove its freedom from symbolical elements of description; but amid the figures employed by Him, three elements of positive teaching are unmistakable: (*a*) that the present world will give way in some kind of cataclysm to a new world; (*b*) that when this occurs Christ will come in the clouds of Heaven; (*c*) that He will then judge mankind, and determine the future place and state of every man.

It is useless to deny that a critical consideration of our Lord's eschatological discourses brings serious problems to light. As given in the Gospels, these discourses are thought by many careful scholars to contain definite teaching that the end of the world and the Lord's second coming were to occur before the existing generation of men had passed away.[2] There are, indeed, elements in the Gospel accounts which leave room for a different conclusion. In particular, our Lord's profession of ignorance as to the day and hour,[3] and His intermingling in one perspective several subject-matters of prediction. But if we

[1] Cf. Dan. vii. 10, 13; Zech. xiv. 5.

[2] *E.g.* A. Schweitzer, *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, ch. xix.

[3] St. Matt. xxiv. 36; St. Mark xiii. 32.

depend solely upon Gospel data,[1] we cannot disprove the contention that Christ used language concerning the nearness of the final cataclysm which the event failed to confirm.

We have ourselves offered a tentative solution of the problem in the next previous volume,[2] a solution which need not be repeated here. A very competent critic among the writer's friends finds it open to serious objection, and time for further reflection has not afforded the writer any assurance as to its finality. But whatever solution is adopted, it can conceivably lead only to one of two alternative conclusions: (*a*) that our Lord taught erroneously on an important spiritual subject; (*b*) that His disciples did not fully grasp His time references, and this has affected the Gospel accounts at least in making them obscure.[3] The first of these conclusions, easy for a rationalist to adopt, is impossible for one to accept who believes in the divine Person and final teaching authority of Jesus Christ. The only credible conclusion, therefore, is that the Gospel accounts do not enable us to ascertain with certainty all that our Lord said and meant as to the time of His second coming.

He undoubtedly taught that He would come again

[1] That is, without considering the Person of Him who taught.

[2] *The Incarnation*, pp. 297–303, where refs. are given.

[3] It appears as if Christ intended to be obscure. Cf. Acts i. 6–7. We need not suppose that the apostolic accounts are essentially incorrect. It is significant that the early Church seems to have suffered no shock in adjusting its interpretation of Christ's words to the delay of His return.

in the clouds of Heaven at the end of the world, and would then judge mankind. Thus the Christian Church has believed and taught, and so we are bound to believe.

III. *Reasons for the Withdrawal*

§ 9. Our Lord's work for mankind was not finished when He redeemed the world by His death and victory over death; but what remained for Him to do could not be accomplished under earthly conditions.[1] The first and most obvious reason for His withdrawal into Heaven was that He might assume a position and standpoint from which He could exercise functions of world-wide scope. He could fittingly die and rise again in provincial Judæa; but apparently He could not suitably relate Himself to multitudes in every nation under Heaven as their living Mediator and Saviour except from the transcendent and centralizing standpoint of the common goal of human journeyings Godward.

This appears in the relations both of space and time. Even in purely mundane affairs provincial limitations reduce what can be done successfully in transacting world business from one earthly centre. But the business of Christ's Kingdom is heavenly as well as earthly, and its heavenly reference is most determina-

[1] On the necessity of His withdrawal, see H. P. Liddon, as cited; W. J. S. Simpson, *Our Lord's Resurrection*, pp. 193–201; W. Milligan, pp. 27–60, 204–216; St. Thomas, III. lvii. 1, 6; Bp. Pearson, fol. 273–275.

tive and most permanent. It is His work to appear for us before the Father, and to unite men of every nation in Himself in their approaches to the Father. His court is therefore in Heaven, and His Church is built so as to have its centre there. The major portion of its membership is in the unseen world; but all are unified in the Body of Christ, and gather around one great throne of Him, its one true Head. All this is represented in the apocalyptic vision of St. John. In the midst of the throne is the Lamb. Around Him are gathered the four mysterious beasts, the four and twenty elders and myriads of angels; and beyond these appears a multitude which no man can number of every nation under Heaven, and every created thing.[1]

The question of our Lord's human presence with His people is involved. While on earth this presence was physical only, and therefore limited to the place of His visible sojourn. It could reach only those who could get physically near Him. Such limitations are inconsistent with His present work and relation to us, but they inhere in earthly residence. By the double mystery of His ascension and of the change which His body has undergone these limitations have been transcended. He is still physically present in one place only, and visible in the physical sense only to those who have gone where He is; but there is also a mystically extended presence of His Body in the whole Church, and a special sacramental presence of

[1] Revel. v. 6–14; vii. 9–11.

His Body and Blood in the Eucharistic mystery.[1] As a consequence, He is with us in a more comprehensively effective way than He could be if His presence were earthly; and as Man He is in His members, the hope of glory. From every part of the world men are enabled to see Him by faith, and are comforted thereby.[2]

Moreover, the ascension enthrones our Lord in the centre of time as well as of space. His human life is, indeed, still subject to time relations, for otherwise it would not be truly human. But these relations are modified and enlarged. There is an endless and abiding quality of His present state and activity which is characteristic of the heavenly. Time measures are there focused in their eternal centre; and the eternal background of our Lord's Person reveals itself more clearly through His glorified Manhood, so that all the ages are, as it were, brought to focus and acted upon by His eternal priesthood. His heavenly functioning is not revealed as a series of actions occurring in successive moments of time, so much as an abiding mystery[3] which is equally operative and effective in and for all times.

§ 10. The work of Christ which has thus been

[1] St. John xiv. 18–20, 28. The present tense of "I come unto you" is significant of a continuing mystery rather than of a single event.

[2] St. John xvi. 19.

[3] Note the descriptive phrases, "Now to appear . . . for us," Heb. ix. 24, and "In the midst of the throne . . . a Lamb standing as though it had been slain," Revel. v. 6.

centralized in space and time, comprehensively speaking, is mediatorial. He is the one Mediator between God and man, upon whose work depends the maintenance of the relations between us and God wherein true religion consists.[1] And since we were made for God — to glorify and enjoy Him — our need of God, and of personal and social or filial relations with Him, is an inevitable manifestation of our nature.[2] Human nature is designedly constituted to make us dependent upon God, lest we should make ourselves independent of Him, and miss the line of spiritual development whereby alone we can actualize and exercise the capacities and functions wherein our life is intended to reach its satisfying completeness and abiding value. Human nature depends upon supernatural grace in order to become what it is designed to become.[3] In this world we are in the making, and in religion the conditions of our making, both divine and human, are united in a mystery of which the mediation of Jesus Christ is the effectuating principle.

What might have been the history of true religion if man had not sinned, we have no means of knowing beyond the broad fact that some species of mediation by the eternal Son would have been needed in any case. Our dependence upon such mediation is an

[1] Cf. *The Incarnation*, ch. ix. § 1.

[2] Cf. *Creation and Man*, pp. 64, 82–84, 206–212, 217–218, 254–255.

[3] *The Incarnation*, ch. iii. § 2; *Creation and Man*, pp. 217–218.

abiding fact, pertaining not only to our initial access to God, but to the continuance of such access and to the enjoyment of eternal life.[1] Under the actual conditions of human history, every stage of the development of true religion represents a step in the preparation for, the upbuilding of, and the final establishment in the heavens of, the conditions under which men can escape from sin, develop after the likeness of God, and, through the grace of Jesus Christ, can enter at last into the full enjoyment of the relations with God for which they were created.[2] The heavenly state and work of Jesus Christ consummates the development of true religion, and guarantees to those who faithfully practise it the full enjoyment of life forever.

The living and ascended Lord is our Mediator and Saviour. And this is not less the case because it is a past achievement, our Lord's death and victory over death, that conditions what He is now doing for us. He redeemed us once for all, but He is saving us now.[3] And He saves us under the moral and sacramental conditions which are afforded in His Church. He is saving us, but in a manner which enlists our own wills and energies. We also have to work out our own salvation [4] in dependence upon, and in concurrence with, the present and effectual

[1] *The Incarnation*, pp. 83–89.

[2] In brief, redemption has a historical context extending through all time. Cf. ch. iii, above.

[3] Heb. vii. 25.

[4] Phil. ii. 12–13.

working of the living Christ and Saviour, in His Body, the Church on earth.

The heavenly work whereby He effectuates all that is wrought out in His members is prophetic, priestly and kingly. As Prophet, He guides His Church by His Holy Spirit into all truth,[1] as the circumstances of its life permit and require. As Priest, He maintains open relations between God and the members of His mystical Body, representing them before the Father's throne in an abiding self-oblation,[2] and bestowing upon them, through His Spirit, the blessings of quickening, cleansing and sanctifying grace. As King, He is the Head of the Body and rules the faithful through the ministry which He has appointed.[3] So it is that the whole economy of truth and grace is focused in the heavens, and the conversation of the redeemed is there centred.[4] From Heaven we look for the Saviour at His second coming to gather His faithful ones to Himself.

§ 11. As reported in the fourth Gospel, our Lord said to His Apostles, "In My Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you. . . . I come again, and will receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." [5] What kind of man-

[1] St. John xvi. 13.
[2] On which see ch. x. Pt. III, below.
[3] Eph. iv. 7–16.
[4] Phil. iii. 20.
[5] St. John xiv. 2–3. The subject has received scant treatment. In Hastings, *Dic. of Christ, s. v.* "Mansions," the word is taken as a figure for rest. Some treat the many mansions as many kinds and degrees of glory.

sions and places He meant, and the manner of His preparing a place for His disciples, He did not explain; but that the preparation of places for His faithful ones is part of His present work is clearly laid down and in terms which seem emphatic.

It seems to be implied that each member of Christ is to have a place or mansion of his own, a place which Christ prepares specifically for him; and this suggests a form of thought concerning human destiny which is of some importance. The destiny of individuals is not to be described in terms of uniformity. No two persons are naturally alike in all respects, and the gifts of grace are distributed by the Spirit in different measures and proportions to each recipient.[1] St. Paul was thinking of something else, but his phrase, "One star differeth from another in glory,"[2] is true when used to signify abiding differences in the personal capacities, gifts and virtues of the subjects of salvation, and in the several destinies for which they are fitted in the world to come. "To him that overcometh . . . I will give him a white stone, and upon the stone a new name written, which no one knoweth but he that receiveth it."[3] This new name perhaps signifies the individuality or characteristic personality of the recipient as registered in Heaven.

Christ prepares for each one his appropriate place in the heavenly city, a place suited to what he has grown to be through the development of his personal

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 4–11. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 41. [3] Revel. ii. 17.

gifts, whether natural or supernatural. To put this in other terms, the elect are predestined to baptismal life, but each in his own vocation and with his own possible line of development and final destiny. And in the heavenly city these several individualities, vocations and destinies are brought into a celestial unity. The city of God draws to itself a multitude of individuals, each having his own characteristics, but all concurring in harmonious life and glory before the throne of God.

§ 12. Our Lord also said, "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send Him unto you."[1] In brief, the coming of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost was conditioned by our Lord's previous withdrawal from this world.[2] In other words, the dispensation of the Spirit is not an independent work, but follows upon, and is bound up with, Christ's sending Him from the Father. The Spirit who descended upon the Church was not only the third Person of the Godhead, but was the Spirit of Christ, coming to perfect the Redeemer's work in us, on the basis of His arrangements.

He could not come, therefore, until Christ should send Him, and the place from which Christ could send Him was that highest Heaven to which He

[1] St. John xvi. 7.

[2] On this, see W. Milligan, pp. 204–216; W. H. Hutchings, *Person and Work of the Holy Ghost*, pp. 96–99; H. B. Swete, *Holy Spirit in the N. Test.*, pp. 373–375; H. P. Liddon, pp. 226–229.

departed at His ascension. Nor was this all. It was part of the divine economy that the Spirit should make the Manhood of Christ, into which He entered at the Incarnation, to be the abiding centre of His work and the medium of His entrance into human hearts for their salvation and sanctification. The grace of God comes to us from Jesus Christ, through His glorified Body, and by the operation of the Spirit in and from that Body.

One divine Person, the eternal Son, alone took our nature. The Holy Spirit is not incarnate. But the Incarnation establishes the conditions under which the dispensation of grace is accommodated to our nature. Therefore these conditions determine the manner in which the Holy Spirit operates in this world for human benefit. He operates as the Spirit who dwells in the nature which our Lord assumed, and as carrying on to fruition the lines of saving work which the Incarnation made possible and initiated.

He could not do this, however, until Christ had enthroned His Manhood in Heaven and had given it the place and glory whereupon its becoming the source of grace to us depends. This being accomplished, the Spirit descended in the Body of Christ, and initiated His earthly work by uniting the *ecclesia* with the Body in glory, thus making it to be the mystical Body of Christ and the home of saving and sanctifying grace.[1]

[1] We return to this in the next volume.

There is no separation between the work of the Son and that of the Spirit. There cannot be, since these Persons are of one Godhead, and work indivisibly in all things.[1] The Spirit does not come to take the place of an absent Lord, but to unite Christ with His disciples, and thus to make Him effectively present with them. The dispensation of the Spirit is thus a perfecting of the work of Jesus Christ, and makes Him in us to be the hope of glory. Every manner of grace which the Spirit imparts to us He imparts from Christ, and our relations to God which He perfects are relations mediated through Christ.

[1] *The Trinity*, pp. 251–252.

CHAPTER X

THE HEAVENLY PRIESTHOOD

I. *Introductory*

§ 1. In a previous volume the priestly office was described as one "in which the function of mediation obtains formal and transactional effect. It is concerned with establishing and perpetuating the relations which ought to be maintained between God and man."[1] The need of maintaining such relations is based upon human nature and destiny. Man is made for God, and his development or preparation for his final estate depends upon, and includes, the cultivation of the relations with his Maker which it is his privelege to enjoy in the life to come. Accordingly, the need of priesthood, whereby these relations are maintained and developed, is elementary, and was not caused in the first instance by human sin. The effect of sin was to complicate the priestly office with the mystery of redemptive suffering, rather than to originate its necessity.

The need which priesthood is designed to satisfy is twofold: (*a*) of divine assistance, or supernatural

[1] *The Incarnation*, p. 281. On priesthood at large, see *Cath. Encyc.*, and *Schaff-Herzog Encyc.*, *q. vv.*; J. Grimal, Pt. I. ch. v.

grace, for the spiritual growth of men after the likeness of God; (*b*) of an effective and divinely acceptable means of approach to God. Accordingly, the priestly office is twofold: (*a*) to dispense the grace of God to men; (*b*) to bring men to God. In both particulars true priesthood is essentially supernatural, and is dependent for validity upon divine sanction. Properly speaking, no mere man can mediate between God and men, and even in the lower sense of ministration under the one true Mediator, no man can take to himself the office of priesthood except he be called of God as was Aaron.[1]

§ 2. The history of religion shows that wherever the characteristic function of religion — the maintenance of acceptable relations with God (or "the gods") — is had in view, priesthood is given a central place. And wherever religion is lacking in priesthood we find either that personal relations with God have no place,[2] or that an intense desire to get rid of mediæval accretions has led to indiscriminating rejection of the primitive Christian doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice and of ministerial priesthood. We also find that the modern rejection in Christian circles of priesthood and sacrifice is being followed by an increasing neglect of the Godward aspects of religion, in the interests of exclusively humanitarian endeavour.

That this should happen is perfectly natural, for

[1] Heb. v. 4–6.

[2] *E.g.* in the Buddhism of Gautama and in Confucianism.

human nature is sacramentally constituted. In all human affairs the invisible and ideal expresses itself in some outward way; and anything which fails to obtain such expression also fails to retain a vital place in men's thoughts and feelings.[1] Moreover, the value of external expression in this regard depends upon its fulness and formality. This is especially apparent where personal relations are involved. Language is required, but unless our words are accentuated by action, and by action which is dictated by recognized formal conventions, they not only fail to impress others, but gradually cease also to have vital significance for ourselves. They cease to sustain and develop the feelings grammatically expressed by them. If I habitually content myself with words in greeting those whom I meet, neglecting the customary actions of courtesy, I show myself to be a boor, and my external boorishness has subjective effect in reducing the strength of my kindly feelings towards others.

Our relations to God are personal relations and require adequate expression, if they are to be sufficiently developed. They are also human — that is, they are relations which human beings have to cultivate, and which such beings can neither express nor cultivate except under the laws that govern human self-expression. Accordingly, as the history of religion, already appealed to, shows, the value of our recognition of our Godward relations depends

[1] Cf. pp. 88–90, where refs. are given.

upon the fulness of our external expression and acknowledgment of them. The fact that God knows our hearts independently of such expression is non-relevant to this argument, because our hearts soon cease to feel what is left unexpressed, and human self-expression is governed by human laws. Moreover, God demands that we shall express our relations to Him, and that we shall do this adequately.[1]

Sacrificial worship is the conventional and accepted method of such expression, one which God Himself has sanctioned. It is true that, like all things performed by human beings, such worship has been subject to corruptions that have drawn forth prophetic rebuke. But this is offset by the circumstance that, while such worship has been profoundly modified by the death of Christ, it has never been abolished by God.[2]

Human nature is not only sacramental, but also social; and our relations to God are social as well as personal. They are not matters of exclusively individual and private concern. Human analogies support this thought. No man can adequately cultivate his relations to his fellow-men on lines of private friendship only. I am related to my best friend not only as an individual, but as a member of society. Personal exclusiveness in this matter

[1] Isa. lv. 6; St. Matt. vi. 9–13; xxvi. 41; St. Luke xviii. 1; Rom. xii. 12; Phil. iv. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 1–3, 8; Heb. iv. 16, etc. Cf. H. P. Liddon, *Some Elements of Religion*, Lec. v. esp. pp. 165–166.

[2] Cf. pp. 124–125, above.

may develop a certain intensity of feeling, but it does so at the cost of a social impoverishment which reduces the value of fellowship.

Our relations to God, being also social, require social and corporate methods of expression. Accordingly, we find public worship to be a normal and central characteristic of religion in every age.[1] And, allowing for the exceptions already hinted at, we find this worship to be sacrificial. That is, men express their relations to God (or "the gods") by some external gift, thereby rendering homage and entering into a divine communion and fellowship.[2] Closely connected with the sacrificial ritual are rites of cleansing or sanctification, and both are performed and administered by men set apart to represent the rest; that is, by priests. The ideas thus institutionally expressed are elementary, and seem to require external embodiment, if religion is to fulfil its characteristic function of fostering and expressing the relations of men to God.

§ 3. The priestly ritual of the Old Testament, whatever may have been the precise nature and history of its development among the Israelites, was more ancient than the Mosaic covenant. What happened to Israel was a reformation of inherited usages, and a divine sanction of the results as ele-

[1] *Creation and Man*, pp. 219–220, 232–235.

[2] The propitiatory element is a later development. The order in which the elements of external gift and communion were developed, is immaterial to their being divinely sanctioned and vital.

ments in a covenant established between Jahveh and His chosen people. Whether this adjustment and divine sanction was accomplished once for all in the Mosaic age, or was not completed until a much later period, is immaterial.[1] In any case, when our Lord came the Jews possessed a divinely sanctioned priestly ritual, the authority of which was plainly, although indirectly, recognized by Him.[2]

Its limitations were patent, and had been sharply set forth by the prophets, sometimes in terms which, when isolated from their biblical context, are easily understood to impugn its divine appointment.[3] The Old Testament sacrifices, to borrow a later method of statement, did not effect what they figured, although they did prefigure in several aspects the effective sacrifice of Jesus Christ.[4] And because they did this, they constituted a present means by which the Israelites could acceptably appear before God and express relations to Him which were to be made good when the Redeemer should come. These methods of expression were needed, although, as the prophets took pains to teach, they were valueless to those who made use of them without repenting of their sins.[5]

[1] On the history of O. Test. sacrifice, see E. F. Willis, *Worship of the Old Covenant;* J. H. Kurtz, *Sacrificial Worship of the O. Test.;* Hastings, *Dic. of Bible, q. v.*, A.; *Schaff-Herzog Encyc., q. v.;* W. R. Smith, *Relig. of the Semites.*

[2] Cf. St. Matt. v. 23–24; xxi. 12–13; xxiii. 1–2, 16–19.

[3] See pp. 7–8, above.

[4] Heb. viii. 4–7; x. 1. Cf. Col. ii. 17.

[5] Cf. Psa. li. 16–19.

The Old Testament ritual constituted a kindergarten school — not less significant because its pupils could not interpret its ceremonies adequately, their full meaning not becoming apparent until they were fulfilled by Christ. As pertaining to such a school, the Aaronic priesthood was a transitory institution,[1] but ministered to the expression of Godward relations which would still need to be expressed on earth after it had given way to the abiding priesthood of Christ.

To illustrate this by leading examples, the ritual of the Day of Atonement could not remove sin, but it prefigured an effective sacrifice for sin; and for this reason its performance was acceptable to God as a provisional and ceremonial cleansing of Israel's worship. The Burnt Offering, by which the Israelites expressed their self-oblation to God, was in itself also ineffective; but it gave sanctioned expression to a dutiful attitude towards God. Therefore it was accepted; and it became a sign and pledge of an effectual means of self-oblation, one which Christ's priesthood should provide in the fulness of time. Finally, the paschal Peace Offering, in which the Israelites sat at God's board, as it were, and sought to enjoy grateful communion with their Maker, was prefigurative only. But it expressed in the most acceptable way then possible the holy communion and fellowship which Christ was

[1] Heb. viii. 6–8; x. 1–2, 8–9.

to obtain by His death, and was to place within human reach in His Church.[1]

§ 4. In its sacrificial aspect our Lord's death accomplished three things: (*a*) It fulfilled the propitiatory elements which had been prefigured in the ritual of the Old Testament sacrifices; (*b*) It consecrated His abiding priesthood in Heaven;[2] (*c*) It afforded a sufficient, permanent and meritorious basis upon which men can now acceptably and effectively offer themselves through Christ to God.

As the ritual of the Day of Atonement ceremonially cleansed the holy place made with hands, and symbolically sanctified the sacrifices of Israel for the whole year, so the death of Christ cleansed — not in mere figure, but really — the heavenly holy place, and sanctified for all time the Eucharistic self-oblations of His redeemed. In the old ritual the High Priest entered into the Holy of Holies once a year, sprinkling the mercy seat with animal blood; but our Lord has entered Heaven once for all through His own blood, and there remaining, makes His flesh the veil through which we also can enter and gain acceptance by His blood.[3]

The death of Christ did not overcome Him, but consecrated Him to an ever-living priesthood, in which the sacrificial mystery is perpetuated by His effective appearance before the Father for us.[4] And this may be prefigured in the Old Testament cere-

[1] For refs. on the meanings of O. T. sacrifices, see p. 6, n. 3, above.
[2] Heb. ix. 12–28. [3] Heb. ix; x. 19–22. [4] Heb. ix. 24.

mony of sending the living scape-goat to an uninhabited place — that is, figuratively speaking, to the heavenly place to which Israel had not yet come.[1]

The Burnt Offerings and Peace Offerings were shadows of this continuing element of the sacrificial mystery. They were connected with the atonement ritual by the pouring of blood at the base of the altar; but they symbolized additional things, things to which priesthood was to minister effectively and permanently when reconciliation to the Father had been achieved by the blood of Christ. The Cross sanctifies the Christian Burnt Offering or Eucharist, in which the appointed memorial of Christ's death enables us to appear in Him before the Father and to offer ourselves as "a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice."[2] And this Eucharist, thus sanctified by the Cross, is also our Peace Offering. It is the Holy Table at which we feast on divine food, on the living Bread which in the Sacrament cometh down from Heaven. Thus we become identified with Christ, and our oblation is accepted for the value which this identification imparts to it.[3]

[1] Levit. xvi. 7–10, 20–22, 26. This interpretation is not the usual one. The ritual has been taken to represent our Lord's substitutionary punishment, the goat perishing in the wilderness. The accepted interpretation to-day treats it as figuring simply the removal of sin from Israel. See S. R. Driver, in *Expositor* for 1885, pp. 214–217; G. B. Stevens, p. 11; Hastings, *Dic. of Bible*, and *Schaff-Herzog Encyc.*, *s. vv.* "Azazel"; J. K. Mozley, pp. 17–23.

[2] Prayer of Oblation in the Liturgy.

[3] St. John vi. 48–51.

It is to be observed that although what Christ's death accomplished was accomplished once for all, and neither may nor can be repeated, the mystery of sacrifice was thereby perfected and made effective rather than ended. The biblical description of what it achieved is "sacrifice for sin," but in biblical use this phrase is not equivalent to the whole drama of sacrifice.[1] It stands for that aspect of sacrifice, that branch of sacrificial ritual, which the ceremony of the Day of Atonement exhibited — the sanctifying, consecrating and validating aspect. In a more comprehensive use of terms, the sacrificial mystery which the so called "sacrifice for sin" consecrates lives on in an abiding sacrificial self-oblation of men through Christ to God. In the Jewish ritual the sacrifice of the Day of Atonement, once offered, was not repeated during the whole year; but sacrifice, none the less, went on. And it went on not only because the more perfect sacrifice of Christ had not yet been offered, but because the self-oblation and communion with God which it expressed needs to be expressed by men under all conditions, even after they have been reconciled to God by the death of His Son. The sins of men did not create the need of sacrifice, although they complicated it with the element of blood. Similarly, the remedy for sin, called "sacrifice for sin," does

[1] So that the teaching that Christ has "offered one sacrifice for sins forever" (Heb. x. 12) does not show that He then brought all true sacrifice to an end.

not do away with sacrifice in its other aspects, but makes it acceptable by affording to it a sanctifying basis. Furthermore, even this "sacrifice for sin" needs to be applied and pleaded in every generation by a suitable memorial of it; and the memorial which Christ appointed, the Holy Eucharist,[1] in so far as it represents and applies the "sacrifice for sin," has the status of a representative and applicatory sacrifice.

II. *Christ's Priestly Office*

§ 5. The death of Christ consecrated Him to be Priest forever after the order of Melchizedek.[2] But the fact that He and no other was called of God to this priesthood is based upon both eternal and historical relations. His priesthood, as we have said, is the transactional element of His mediation between God and man, and His being a true Mediator is due to His uniting in His own Person the eternal and the historical, the nature of God and the nature of man. Unless He had been very God, He could not have been the full Representative of God to men that He claimed to be; and unless He had identified Himself with us by taking our nature, He apparently

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 26. The word "show" (A. V.) should be "proclaim" or "celebrate." Cf. § 11, below.

[2] Heb. v. 5–6, 10, etc. Cf. Psa. cx. 4. On the priestly office of Christ, see *The Incarnation*, pp. 281–293; Wm. Milligan, *Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood;* Geo. Milligan, *Theol. of the Ep. to the Heb.*, chh. vi-vii; R. C. Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, pp. 244–249; M. F. Sadler, *One Offering*, chh. vii-ix; St. Thomas, III. xxii; P. G. Medd, *One Mediator*, §§ 40–43.

could not have been recognized by men as the Head of their race, and as their proper Representative before God.

It is because He adequately fulfils the need which is expressed in the Book of Job, of a daysman who can lay his hand on both,[1] that He is the one Mediator between God and man, the one Priest whose priesthood is inherent, and from which every valid priesthood among men is derived. The Aaronic priesthood constituted His human agency in preparing the way for His own manifestation; and the Christian priesthood is His agency for enabling us to participate in the mysteries which His personal mediation alone makes valid. All true priesthood is His priesthood, and earthly priests are purely ministerial, deriving their functions wholly from His commission.[2]

One thing more needs to be said in treating of the mediatorial basis of our Lord's priesthood. If His equipment for mediation on the divine side is found in His possession of the fulness of the Godhead, His personal fitness for these functions is to be explained by His eternal status and relation in the divine Trinity. This is a matter concerning which our knowledge is very limited and highly symbolical. Yet we are able to discern a peculiar fitness in the

[1] Job ix. 33.

[2] See R. C. Moberly, *op. cit.*, ch. vii. II; D. Stone, *Christian Church*, pp. 251–252; M. F. Sadler, ch. viii; P. G. Medd, *op. cit.*, §§ 184–185.

fact that the Son, rather than either the Father or the Holy Spirit should assume our nature, and should perfect Himself for the priesthood on its human side by suffering and death. The filial relation to God which it is the work of the Mediator to secure and perfect in our behalf was obviously more fittingly participated in by Him who is the proper Son of God, than by any other divine Person. Furthermore, He who is the Image of the invisible God, and the Word of God, most conveniently fulfils the divinely representative and revelational aspects of mediation between God and man.[1]

Accordingly, the limitations of our knowledge and descriptions of the relations subsisting between the divine Persons, do not prevent us from perceiving a patent reasonableness in the designation of the Son of God to be our Priest before the Father's throne. Conforming to His mission, and obeying the Father's will, He came into the world. And "glorified not Himself to be made a high priest, but He that spake unto Him, 'Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee,' as He saith also in another place, 'Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek.'"[2] Thus appointed, He took our nature, being made "like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God."[3]

[1] St. Thomas, III. iii; Rich. Hooker, *Eccles. Polity*, V. li. 2–3; A. J. Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, ch. vi. § 1.

[2] Heb. x. 5–10; v. 5–6. [3] Heb. ii. 17.

§ 6. Guided by divine inspiration, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews selects certain accidents of the Old Testament narrative concerning Melchizedek, and gives them symbolic reference to Christ's priesthood.[1] From the fact that Levi, from whom the Aaronic priesthood sprang, was in the loins of Abraham when he gave tithes to Melchizedek, and was blessed by him, the superiority of the order of Melchizedek to that of Aaron is inferred. The further fact that no beginning or end of days is ascribed to Melchizedek — he simply appears — is treated symbolically as signifying the endlessness of the priesthood of Christ, who "because He abideth forever hath an unchangeable priesthood."

Only the eternal is in the proper sense of terms unchangeable or "inviolable."[2] If, therefore, the priesthood of Christ is thus to be described, it is eternal. It is this because it is the priesthood of an eternal Person, of the one who amid all the changes of time remains the same, whose years cannot fail;[3] that is, of Him in whom all temporal things cohere. Just as the centre of a circle is in the midst of the whole circumference, however vast the circle may be, and is its determining principle, so the eternal Son is central to the whole circumference of time, and what He is and does determines its historical

[1] Heb. vii. 1–24. Cf. Gen. xiv. 18–20.
[2] Heb. vii. 24 (R. V.), margin.
[3] Heb. i. 8–12.

curve — the significance and value of its every part and movement.[1]

It is precarious to base any argument upon the exegesis which makes the Apocalypse assert that the Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world.[2] But such an assertion, if it were made, would embody an important truth — the truth that whatever the eternal Son achieves for mankind is achieved from the centre of all time, and is effectual for all the ages. The death of Christ, considered as an event, was subject to the laws of time, and did not happen — was not an event — until a certain human date. But the event was more than an event. It was the emergence in history of an eternal purpose and movement, which has determined the curve or course of history from the beginning. The death of Christ has had effect in every age, although its retroactive effects require a different manner of description from that which we use in speaking of its subsequent effects.[3]

We shall miss vital aspects of the mystery if we reduce the retroactive aspects of the Cross, and of the priesthood which it consecrates, to mere foreordination. The "fore" in this case does not refer to priority in time, but to the eternal nature and validity of the ordination, which is central to every

[1] Cf. *Being and Attrib. of God*, pp. 253–256; *Creation and Man*, pp. 5–7.

[2] Revel. xiii. 8. Cf. xvii. 8.

[3] Cf. ch. ii. § 5, above.

moment of time because transcending all times.[1] The cause of redemption, historically described, is the death of Christ, which occurred at a certain temporal moment. But the cause is also an eternal one, revealing its working in every dispensation, although revealing it differently in each and in conformity to the laws of history and of human progress.

Behind the primitive possibilities of human sin lay the corrective mystery of redemption.[2] This was effectual from the moment of man's fall in preserving the race from total depravity and ruin. It imparted validity to each successive covenant, and to the sacrificial approach to God which was provided for in each. The prefigurative aspects of Old Testament ritual, in particular, connect that ritual with the Cross, and teach us that the Cross lay behind it and made it acceptable, when contritely performed, in spite of the fact that redemption had not yet been historically achieved.

It is comparatively easy for our imagination to grasp the truth that the death of Christ has redemptive effect in subsequent ages, for we are wont to describe the relations of cause and effect in terms of temporal antecedence and consequence. But this very facility of apprehension may hinder us from realizing that the temporal gap between Christ's death and the application of redemption to men in

[1] *Being and Attrib. of God*, pp. 281–282. Cf. p. 284.

[2] A fact to be reckoned with in facing the problem of evil. See *Creation and Man*, pp. 134–135.

later ages cannot be bridged, so as to make one the effectual cause of the other, unless there be an eternal *nexus*, an abiding mystery in which the Cross lives on as a never ending and ever operative principle.

The required *nexus* is found in the Person and priesthood of Jesus Christ. This priesthood is exercised from an eternal standpoint, and is effectively valid for every age, for the whole circumference of time. But, historically described, it is the sequel of our Lord's death, by which it is consecrated, and from which its validity in historical and human application is derived.[1]

§ 7. In two respects we may describe our Lord's death as accomplishing effects once for all, effects which we may not seek to accomplish again without falling into very serious error. In the first place, His death has achieved full and perfect redemption for all mankind,[2] and upon this redemption is based the whole dispensation of salvation — salvation which redemption of itself does not achieve, but which in every age and race must be worked out through personal application of the merits of the Cross.

In the second place, and in more direct connection with our immediate subject, Christ's death once for all consecrates His priesthood, and makes it effectual for the acceptance of men by God where-

[1] The relation of the Eucharist to the Cross becomes an external one, engendering a tendency to make the Eucharist an *additional* sacrifice, when the connecting link of Christ's existing heavenly priesthood is ignored.

[2] Cf. pp. 121–122, above.

ever and whenever they approach Him in contrite union with Christ. It does so because it imparts to the "somewhat" that Christ has "to offer"[1] in our behalf the propitiatory value which our sins require that it shall possess. To put this in another way, a "sacrifice for sin" has been made which is so sufficient that no more sacrifice of this description is needed. The Day of Atonement ritual has expired by fulfilment in Christ's death.

This fact has profoundly modified priesthood and sacrifice at large. If previous to accomplished redemption it was necessary that the copies of the things in the heavens, the things of Israel's Tabernacle, should be cleansed with the bloody sacrifices which were then offered, the achievement of redemption has changed the whole situation. The things now to be cleansed are heavenly things; and they are cleansed with better sacrifices than these, that is, by Christ now appearing before the face of God for us.[2]

Sacrificial ritual on earth has been reconstituted, therefore, to agree with the new conditions. We no longer connect our self-oblations and communions with an ineffective Day of Atonement ritual by shedding of blood, as was done in the Jewish Burnt Offerings and Paschal Feasts; but we make a bloodless memorial of the death of Christ; and through sacramental feeding on the Body and Blood of the living Christ we identify ourselves with Him in appearing

[1] Heb. viii. 3. [2] Heb. ix. 23–24.

before the Father. We continue to offer sacrifice, for to do so is the acceptable mode of rendering creaturely homage to God; but we do not repeat the "sacrifice for sin," nor do we make bloody offerings at all. We celebrate the Lord's death until He comes again,[1] and in doing so we offer ourselves in Jesus Christ as "a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice," to God the Father. If our offering of the sacrifice is repeated, the sacrifice which we offer is not. It is that which the Cross made and perfected, and which lives on forever.[2]

§ 8. In its temporal aspects the priesthood of Christ is necessarily fulfilled in His human nature. There are several reasons for this.

In the first place, it is obviously convenient that an office which has been consecrated by what our Lord suffered in His Manhood should be exercised in the nature in which He was thus consecrated. Moreover, His passion itself was human not only because His Godhead was insusceptible of such an experience, but also because He suffered as our Vicar and Representative; and, as we have seen, if He was to be a true Mediator between God and man, He had to bring Himself into effective identification with mankind in His mediatorial work. This He did by taking our nature, and by submitting to the conditions of human experience.[3] His passion was the perfecting of His Manhood for the priestly

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 26. [2] Cf. § 11, below.
[3] Heb. ii. 16–18.

use to which He was to put it,[1] when He had carried it successfully through death and had enabled it to participate in His incorruption and immortality.

The Manhood which was thus perfected included the body, which became the external medium and instrument of His heavenly priesthood. The convenience of this method can be seen when we reckon with the laws that govern human receptivity and expression — laws which explain the necessity of the sacramental order. We are so constituted that all our apprehensions, subjective acts of assimilation, and efforts to express the spirit that is in us, depend upon enlistment of corporal conditions and functions.[2] Therefore our Mediator has adapted His priestly functioning to these conditions. His saving grace is made to flow into us from His glorified Body, and His Flesh is the veil through which, by His Blood, we gain access to God, and are enabled to offer ourselves to Him in the selfsame Body of Christ.

It is under these conditions that the Holy Spirit works.[3] Indeed it is His work to make them effectual for our regeneration, cleansing, perfecting and recovery from death to incorruption and immortality. His descent upon the first Christians in the upper room united them with Christ's glorified Manhood, and thus constituted of them that extension of

[1] Heb. ii. 10–11; iv. 15.

[2] Cf. ch. vii. § 11; and pp. 88–89, 296, above.

[3] Cf. pp. 291–292, above. On the subject of this section, see Geo. Milligan, pp. 78–84; J. Grimal, pp. 73–81.

Christ's Body in this world which is called the mystical Body. In and from this Body, which is the visible Church of Christ, the spirit operates in the dispensation of grace from Christ.

III. *The Heavenly Oblation*

§ 9. As has been said elsewhere, priesthood has the twofold function of bestowing grace from God on creatures, and of effecting their sacrifice or self-oblation to God. Both functions are of permanent necessity, for man is evermore dependent upon divine grace, and never ceases to be under obligation to offer himself in sacrificial homage to God. But sacrifice is not summed up in the immolation of a victim; and the death of Christ, while it perfects and consecrates the sinner's self-oblation, does not bring to an end the necessity of offering the sacrifice. The sacrifice is made — constituted — by the Cross, but lives on in a perpetual heavenly oblation.[1]

Therefore it is necessary that the High Priest, in whose priestly functioning the sacrifice lives on, should "have somewhat to offer." The sacred writer who thus teaches points to the fact that the priesthood to which this necessity pertains is not fulfilled on earth.[2] We are therefore precluded from taking

[1] On the heavenly oblation, see J. J. I. von Dœllinger, *First Age of the Church*, pp. 45–60; W. Milligan, pp. 114–149; Geo. Milligan, ch. vii, esp. pp. 139 *et seq.;* M. F. Sadler, ch. vii; A. P. Forbes, *Thirty-Nine Arts.*, pp. 607–611; S. C. Gayford, in *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, Apr. 1913, pp. 458–467.

[2] Heb. viii. 3–4.

him to mean that the oblation which he declares to be involved in Christ's priesthood was His death on earth, conceived of as ending the necessity of having somewhat to offer. The thought is that so long as He is priest He must have somewhat to offer. On the continuing mystery of this heavenly oblation depends the possibility of our active and sacramental participation in the sacrifice, our effective oblation of ourselves to God on the basis of the Cross. Only in and through a continuing priest, and an abiding priestly function in the heavens, can we offer what is conventionally described as our "representative and applicatory" sacrifice.

What, then, is the manner of our Lord's heavenly oblation? It may easily be misconceived, as if it were an action conforming externally to earthly analogies. That it cannot be thus described must be clear when we reckon with its continuous nature and with heavenly conditions. The earthly method is determined by our temporal conditions, and is repetitious. We must be renewing our oblations by repeated actions, because not otherwise can we maintain and adequately express the relation and attitude which sacrifice is intended to express. But such a method involves interruptions between acts of oblation, and these cannot be ascribed to the heavenly mystery in which our oblations are unified and obtain acceptance with God. There is truth in the denial that Christ continues to

"sacrifice Himself,"[1] for what is had in mind by such a form of denial is an external action, which from the nature of things could only endure by repetition.

The New Testament describes the mystery in symbolic terms, for no other terms are available. What seems to be the most determinative description is that "Christ entered . . . into Heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us."[2] Offering Himself often or repetitiously is expressly excluded, for the one act on His part which is capable *in se* of repetition — the act which makes, and abidingly validates, His appearing for us — was His suffering on the Cross, and this was fulfilled once for all. There is, then, something in His appearance which constitutes His oblation, and this appearance is a continuous mystery. What this is seems to be hinted at elsewhere in the New Testament, where our Lord is described as a Lamb standing in the midst of the heavenly throne, "as though it had been slain."[3] The meaning seems to be that the very appearance of the Lamb reveals the fact of its having been slain, while its standing posture symbolizes living functioning of some kind. That the wounds incurred on the Cross remain as "dear tokens

[1] A denial that is non-relevant, for those who emphasize our Lord's heavenly oblation do not thus describe it.

[2] Heb. ix. 24–26. St. Thomas, III. lvii. 6, says, "Ipsa enim repræsentatio sui ex natura humana, quam in cœlum intulit, est quædam interpellatio pro nobis."

[3] Revel. v. 6.

of His passion" need not be maintained;[1] but the thought that somehow our Lord's visible appearance in glory constitutes an abiding memorial of His death, and has functional value in His living priesthood before the Father, seems plainly to be implied.

§ 10. These symbols have to do with the external side of the heavenly oblation. But there is the moral aspect and objective effect; and this is included in what is expressed by the words, "Wherefore also He is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them."[2] The word translated "to make intercession," ἐντυγχάνειν, does not have the restricted meaning of "to pray for," but signifies to meet and transact with one person in reference to another. As applied to our Lord's heavenly work the phrase refers both to the objective and to the moral elements of His priesthood — to His external appearing for us, and to those elements and aspects which make this appearing morally significant and effectual. It is with the moral aspects that we are now concerned. They are threefold.

(*a*) In the first place, because the heavenly priesthood is consecrated by, and based upon, our Lord's

[1] Yet Christ appears to have retained them after His resurrection, when He used them to convince the doubting Thomas. St. John xx. 27–28.

[2] Heb. vii. 25. See B. F. Westcott, *Ep. to the Heb., in loc.;* Geo. Milligan, pp. 124–125, note; W. Milligan, pp. 149–161.

death, it has all the moral significance and value of that death. Christ's intercession is in this respect a representation before the Father of His meritorious "sacrifice for sin," a transaction which necessarily possesses the merit and appealing power of what it represents. All that has elsewhere been said by way of setting forth the moral value of the passion of Christ, whether in Godward or in manward relations, applies to the priesthood which it consecrated. The heavenly oblation is the memorial of our Lord's death, whereby its merits and redemptive value for men are represented before the Father.

(*b*) In the second place, in appearing for us our Lord is still offering Himself for us to God. In the "somewhat" which He offers, therefore, the Father recognizes His beloved Son in whom He is well pleased — well pleased not only because Jesus Christ is the only-begotten Son of His love, but because of the self-effacing obedience by means of which that Son has humanly increased in His favour.[1] Moreover, the members of Christ, for whom He died, are mystically united with and present in Him; and the Father accepts them as thus identified with His Beloved. Speaking symbolically, the Father wills to look "on His anointed face, and only look on us as found in Him."[2] The value which is discovered in our great High Priest is imparted to us, and makes us acceptable in Him.

[1] St. Luke ii. 52. Cf. Phil. ii. 6–11.

[2] Hymn by the late Dr. W. Bright.

(*c*) There is no substitution, no unreal imputation or forensic transfer of merits in this; for, in the third place, the mystery of justifying grace is involved. We are accounted righteous by God because through union with Christ his grace is bestowed upon us, and brings about our progressive conformity to Him. Our faith is imputed to us for righteousness because it is the first step in our becoming righteous after the likeness of Jesus Christ, by His grace and our coöperation therewith in working out our own salvation. Accordingly, coincidently with our coming to God in Christ, He is also saving us to the uttermost; and because of this we are accepted by God for the value which is growing in us.[1]

§ 11. Christ is not our substitute in self-oblation; and if we are to derive benefit from His offering, we must personally share in it by offering ourselves to God in union with Him. There must, therefore, be some earthly action in connection with our Lord's heavenly oblation, by the performance of which we can fulfil this condition and make the sacrifice our own, representing it and applying its benefits to ourselves. In brief, we have to offer a representative and applicatory sacrifice, and this has been made possible for us by our Lord's institution of the Holy Eucharist.

In this mystery we are enabled to make a sacramental identification of ourselves with our heavenly

[1] We do not hide behind Christ, but *appear* in Christ, so related to Him as to be growing in His likeness. Cf. ch. viii. § 10, above.

Priest and with what He offers to the Father;[1] and thus united with Him, we offer what He offers, thereby offering ourselves in it effectively and acceptably to God, a "reasonable holy and living sacrifice." This presupposes, of course, the subjective conditions of faith and repentance, apart from the fulfilment of which we cannot gain acceptance. The Eucharistic mystery supplies the objective factor, the formal transaction, which gives effect in the appointed manner to our self-oblations. It is our sacrifice — not as additional to that of the Cross nor as repeating Christ's death, but derivatively, as the divinely afforded means whereby we celebrate it, plead it, and in the meritorious or sanctifying power of it offer ourselves in the living Christ to God.

The form of the Eucharistic oblation is determined both by what it represents and enables us to join in offering, and by the necessities which our earthly conditions impose upon us. On the one hand, because it is the sacrament and vehicle of the Body and Blood of Christ, our offering it is a true memorial of His death and an effective method of participating in the offering of that sacrifice. Moreover, because the living Christ is the Priest and invisible substance of the sacrament, by offering it we unite our earthly oblation with His heavenly one, in which His death is effectively represented before the Father.

[1] This subject will be more fully dealt with in our ninth volume. See D. Stone, *Holy Communion*, chh. v, vii; Chas. Gore, *Body of Christ*, ch. iii; M. F. Sadler, *One Offering*.

On the other hand, although the sacrifice is one, consecrated once for all by Christ's death, and exhibited by a continuous appearance of Christ in Heaven, our participation in it is subject to temporal and physical limitations, and to the necessity of frequent renewals. These limitations are accentuated by our imperfections, and by the necessity that we should frequently repent and express our repentance by renewing the formal self-oblation which our sins have emptied of moral and personal value. Accordingly, we offer frequent Eucharists, and repeat the action by which our material gifts of bread and wine are consecrated and become the Body and Blood of Christ.[1] But it is the creaturely substance that is thus repeatedly consecrated. The sacred thing of which it becomes the sacrament and vehicle is not consecrated again. It was consecrated once for all when it hung on the Cross. What is repeated is our identification of ourselves with it and the effective self-oblation which this identification enables us to renew.

§ 12. There is but one true sacrifice, to wit, the sacrifice which was made on the Cross, which lives on in Christ's appearance for us, and which becomes properly our own sacrifice by our Eucharistic representation of it and participation in it.

[1] Not by physical conversion, but in a sense, none the less, that made it true that the bread and the cup, when blessed by the Lord in the night of His betrayal, should be, as He said they were, His Body and His Blood.

It is one in time, being effected once for all on the Cross, and having effect in every age of human history through Christ's eternal Person, and through the abiding nature of His heavenly oblation. Under whatever dispensational conditions men approach God in sacrificial ritual, this ritual unites them at least ceremonially — in the Eucharist effectually — with the sacrifice of Christ. Each generation offers sacrifice after its appointed manner, but the sacrifice which is always signified is essentially that of Calvary.[1] And it is not less truly this because the manner in which men signify it varies in successive dispensations, and has been changed since its historic accomplishment from prefigurative shedding of blood to unbloody and sacramental representation and application.

The sacrificial oblations which men offer in many lands and at many altars are also one in their local and objective reference; for they are all identified with the heavenly mystery of the Lamb standing in the heavenly throne. They are united with that mystery because what is offered everywhere is sacramentally identified with what there appears as having been slain for us. The Holy Place not made with hands is the local centre of all Eucharists; and the Flesh of Christ, through the veil of which we gain entrance by His Blood,[2] is locally present in one

[1] That is, in Christian interpretation. The meaning of pre-Christian sacrificial ritual was deeper than its users had come to perceive.

[2] Heb. x. 19–22.

throne, around which are gathered multitudes which no man can number in every nation under Heaven.[1]

The sacrifice is also one because in every offering of it there is one and the same Priest and Victim, and one consecration by His death on the Cross. The heavenly oblation is the abiding token above of what was done on Calvary, and the Eucharistic sacrifice is the recurring earthly celebration of that mystery. Earthly priests minister only as agents of Christ, and He is the real Priest and Oblation in every Eucharist.

[1] Revel. vii. 9–15.

THE·PLIMPTON·PRESS
NORWOOD·MASS·U·S·A